DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 750 24 VT 008 830

By-Messersmith, Lloyd E., Medsker, Leland L.

Problems and Issues in Accreditation by Specialized Agencies of Vocational-Technical Curricula in Postsecondary Institutions.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Cooperative Research Program.
Bureau No-BR-7-0048
Pub Date 69
Grant-OEG-4-7-000048-0473
Note-142p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$7.20
Descriptors-*Accreditation (Institutions), Agency Role, *Community Colleges, Costs, Educational Administration, Federal Legislation, *Junior Colleges, National Surveys, *Professional Associations, Questionnaires, Standards, Technical Education, *Vocational Education

The study sought information on specialized accreditation regarding (1) extensiveness, (2) effects upon program development, and (3) concerns of specialized agencies related to standards of training. Methodology consisted of (1) study of materials and legislation relating to the scope and function of professional and regional accrediting agencies, (2) interviews with key personnel of accrediting agencies, (3) questionnaire survey of 43 2-year institutions in 18 states with both regional and/or specialized accreditation, and (4) a questionnaire survey of five professional associations most active in 2-year college vocational programs. Extensive findings and conclusions include the following (1) The specialized agency visualizes its role as protecting the welfare of the public, while the institution perceives the agency as a source of help in improving programs and considers specialized accreditation a device for increasing prestige, attracting better students, and securing funds, (2) Specialized agencies have not proliferated at a great rate, (3) Regional and specialized accreditation appear to reinforce each other, and (4) The task appears to be to devise a means by which each of the forms can facilitate the other. (JK)

ED 030750

BL 70048 BR-7-00
PA 08 PA-24

The Center for
Research and Development in
Higher Education

PROBLEMS AND ISSUES IN ACCREDITATION BY SPECIALIZED AGENCIES OF VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL CURRICULA IN POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

Lloyd E. Messersmith
and
Leland L. Medsker

VT008830

University of California, Berkeley

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

1

PROBLEMS AND ISSUES IN ACCREDITATION BY SPECIALIZED AGENCIES OF VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL CURRICULA IN POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

2

Lloyd E. Messersmith

and

②

Leland L. Medsker

1969

The research reported herein was supported by Grant No. OEG-4-7-000048-0473, Project No. 7-0048, with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the provision of the Cooperative Research Program. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

CONTENTS

PREFACE

I. The Accreditation Problem: Design for a Study 1

II. Recent History and Current Status of Specialized Accreditation 7

III. The Professional Association and Its Accrediting Function 21

IV. The Institution and the Accrediting Agency 44

V. Conclusions and Implications 68

APPENDIXES 90
- A. Institutions Included in Survey
- B. Accreditation Questionnaire
  Questionnaire to Chief Administrative Officers
- C. Questionnaire to Professional Associations
- D. Questionnaire to Regional Associations
- E. Accreditation Fees and Dues
- F. Tables

REFERENCES 138

PREFACE

The authors are pleased to present this report on a study of accreditation by specialized agencies of vocational-technical curricula in postsecondary institutions. The need for such a study, which was perceived by numerous agencies and individuals, culminated in a request to the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education to undertake the task late in 1966, with funds supplied by the U.S. Office of Education.

As is pointed out in the report, some of those tensions with respect to accreditation which were generated by an act of legislation were eased during the course of the study; but the problems related to accreditation at this level are still many and complex. They are, of course, deeply imbedded in the total accreditation process as it operates within higher education in the United States, and are increasingly complicated by new manpower needs and the nationwide tendency to satisfy these needs through education in postsecondary, prebaccalaureate institutions. Hopefully, this report will be helpful to those who must be concerned with the accreditation process at this level. It must be emphasized, however, that the process at this and other levels of higher education will function effectively in the future only if those involved engage in continued study, experimentation, and diligent cooperation.

We are greatly indebted to many individuals and organizations without whose assistance the study could not have been completed and the report prepared. An initial advisory committee, composed of Frank G. Dickey, John R. Proffitt, Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., William

Shannon, Lowell Burkett, and David S. Bushnell was most helpful in advising on the dimensions of the study at the outset. In addition, Messrs. Dickey, Proffitt, and Shannon provided valuable consultation many times during the course of the study. Obviously, special appreciation is due David S. Bushnell and his office for their willingness to fund the project. Equally obvious is the fact that the study could not have been completed without the cooperation of those who represented the numerous professional associations and the two-year institutions which supplied the data.

Two members of the Center staff were invaluable in the conduct of the study and the preparation of the report: Rudolph Melone was most helpful in advising on both the study and the report, and finally, we are greatly indebted to Harriet Renaud for her tireless and efficient editorial efforts to make the report cogent and concise.

Lloyd E. Messersmith, Project Director

Leland L. Medsker, Director
Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
Berkeley, California

CHAPTER I

THE ACCREDITATION PROBLEM: DESIGN FOR A STUDY

The relationship between institutions which offer specialized vocational-technical curricula and the professional associations which grant accreditation to such curricula has long occupied the attention of community colleges, technical institutes, and a variety of other institutions at the postsecondary level. Definition and delineation of the role of accrediting agencies has also been a major preoccupation of the National Committee on Accrediting, and the degree of its involvement and range of its efforts can be regarded as indices of the widening concern about who should accredit and to what purpose.

In recent years, the necessity for clarifying the implications of accrediting procedures and philosophy has been intensified by a number of interrelated social and educational developments. Chief among them has been the rapidly increasing interest of the Federal government in allocating funds to eligible vocational programs in accredited institutions.

The study reported here is about certain critical aspects of the accreditation issue and is an attempt to assess its present and future role in vocational-technical education in the United States today.

Background of the Problem

In the past few years, complex social needs and forces have generated a conspicuous and ongoing expansion of nonbaccalaureate educational institutions throughout the country. The remarkable growth of the community college has been the most notable development; but an unprecedented number of technical institutes, area vocational schools, and lower-division units of four-year colleges also have been established, and the value of those already in existence has been newly acknowledged and emphasized.

All these and similar institutions share a function in common: They provide technical-vocational programs leading directly to employment. Such programs range from courses in what are commonly referred to as the trades (training in specific skills and related areas) to preparation for semi-professional jobs in the health services, social service, business, and technology. It is because of the critical shortage of trained manpower in these fields that government agencies and foundations have become increasingly interested in programs of vocational training, an interest expressed on a functional level by legislation and financial aid.

Thus, supported by social concensus, endorsed by active segments of the educational community, and reinforced by opening avenues for funding, there is no question that training at the two-year college level will continue to expand, and will accommodate increasing percentages of young adult high school graduates and older adults with or without high school diplomas.

The inevitable corollary to this widespread interest and engagement in vocational training is concern for the setting of standards. There are, of course, many agencies that perform this function, among them the community colleges themselves, other institutions that offer technical-vocational programs, state governing boards, regional accrediting associations, and professional associations. It is on professional organizations as accrediting agencies that this study is specifically focused.

Over the years, as various professional agencies sought to accredit segments of educational programs in colleges and universities, numerous problems were generated. When it became imperative, finally, to diminish some of the chaos and confusion associated with accreditation by specialized agencies, the National Commission on Accrediting was established in 1949.

Although institutions offering vocational training have been represented on the commission, accreditation of their programs was not considered an acute problem and the commission was not forced either by general need or special circumstance to deal specifically with this kind of accreditation in post high school institutions. Recently, however, the various professional associations have responded to the increased emphasis on vocational training by concerning themselves more deeply with the programs offered, and these intensified accreditation activities have raised both theoretical and practical issues, among the most central being:

1) It is clear that a relatively new institution such as the community college, with its diverse functions and high visibility in the community, has both a great need to institutionalize itself and a great vulnerability to the impact of outside forces. To what extent, then, do ancillary influences, including accreditation, encroach on an institution's integrity and place constraints on its ability to build an identity of its own?

2) It is equally clear that vocational-technical education on a widespread scale, having only lately won sanction as a necessity in an increasingly technical society, also is in process of identifying itself and also is particularly sensitive to impinging forces. Will this type of training find its own form and level through the natural means of cooperation between training institutions and employers, or will its shape be determined by the professional agencies related to each vocational area?

Recognizing the far-reaching implications of such questions, and following on a series of conferences and reports, in 1966 the American Association of Junior Colleges and the National Commission on Accrediting asked the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education to consider a research project on specialized accreditation in two-year colleges. Representatives from these organizations, in addition to those from the American Vocational Association and the U. S. Office of Education, agreed on the need for an exploratory study to determine the nature and dimensions of the problem.

Subsequently, with funds provided by the U. S. Office of Education, the Center initiated a study of the issues that cluster around the general problem, and are reflected in questions such as these:

1) To what extent are specialized agencies now approving curricula in two-year colleges?

2) Is there evidence that specialized accreditation either inhibits or promotes the development of occupational programs?

3) Does the specialized agency have concerns related to standards and the level of training given by institutions?

The Design

The study was designed to focus on post high school prebaccalaureate institutions and their relationship to organizations concerned with accreditation. Materials relating to the scope and function of both professional and regional accrediting agencies were collected and analyzed; Federal and state legislation pertaining to the role of accrediting agencies in funding, certification, and licensure were reviewed; key personnel from professional and regional accrediting agencies were interviewed; and three questionnaires were developed and administered.

Forty-three two-year institutions in 18 states were studied. These included a sample with both regional and specialized accreditation, a sample with regional accreditation which, for a variety of reasons, had not applied for specialized accreditation, and a sample with specialized accreditation only. A questionnaire, cover letter, and self-addressed, stamped envelope were sent to the chief administrative officer, academic dean, director or coordinator of vocational-technical education, and various program chairmen of each college.

A questionnaire relating to specialized accreditation activity was also sent to the executive secretaries of the five professional associations found to be most active in two-year college vocational programs. (A total of 28 professional associations had been sanctioned by the NCA to accredit programs in colleges and universities.) Another questionnaire was sent to the executive secretaries of the six regional associations. After approximately three weeks, a follow-up letter asking for cooperation was sent to nonrespondents.

Analyses were made of approximately 315 returns.

The report delineates the issues related to specialized accreditation and focuses on their implications for the two-year college. The recent and most relevant developments in accreditation, both by specialized agencies and the regional associations, are reviewed and assessed in order to define the dimensions of the problem and the pressures which have operated to motivate accrediting activity in prebaccalaureate institutions.

The questionnaire data and interview material are analyzed and conclusions drawn. Key questions are raised and discussed, some solutions are suggested, and specific recommendations for further research are made.

CHAPTER II

RECENT HISTORY AND CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIALIZED ACCREDITATION

Federal programs of aid to higher education traditionally have been free of accreditation requirements as a primary condition for funding. Generally, recognition was given to institutions with regional accreditation, or in some instances, to programs with specialized accreditation. When, in 1964 and 1965, the Nurse Training Act specified accreditation by the National League for Nursing as a prerequisite for Federal support to nursing programs, two-year institutions responded to this development with considerable anxiety. It was widely feared that this was a precedent for the potential involvement of numerous specialized accrediting agencies, all of which might clamor for equal recognition with regard to other Federal programs.

Some part of the anxiety derived from a natural concern for protecting institutional autonomy; administrators and faculty could foresee the loss of freedom to plan programs and innovations in the face of uniform accreditation demands. Practitioners visualized a situation in which each technical program (and on some campuses this could be as many as 75 programs) would be forced to undergo accreditation both for purposes of funding and for placement of graduates; whole colleges, they felt, could be swallowed up in the mechanics of massive accrediting procedures. The proliferation of accrediting activity was seen both as a threat to institutional self-direction and as an expensive and time-consuming activity.

It was against this background of concern that the present study was undertaken by the Center. The prospect of a study did not allay all of the fears relative to specialized accreditation. There was continued uneasiness about the role that the Federal government would or should play in bringing about a series of accreditation crises, and there has been increasing concern about the possible effects of restrictive legislation on the voluntary accrediting process. The study was not confined to the area of Federal aid alone, however, for specialized accreditation and its attendant problems have nagged higher education for some time, and pose special problems for the two-year institution.

The following brief chronological recapitulation is included as background, to bring the issue of specialized accreditation into historical perspective and to elucidate recent developments as they relate to the two-year college.

In 1961 the American Association of Junior Colleges requested the National Commission on Accrediting to "study the extent of and the factors relating to the accreditation of junior colleges by specialized agencies." Subsequently, a special committee forwarded a report to AAJC early in 1962, on the basis of which the National Commission on Accrediting began to investigate some of the possible consequences of such accrediting activity for training at the junior college level.

Two exploratory meetings and a series of follow-up meetings were held late in 1964 by various groups in an attempt to analyze the problem. It was during this period that the U. S. Commissioner of Education named the National League for Nursing the accrediting body for qualification under Federal legislation, and the problem and its ramifications for the two-year colleges became clearer.

Currently, one of the most obvious problems in specialized accreditation is one which was not a primary focus of this investigation, but which is polarizing the accrediting movement. It was brought to light by the issues and attitudes which surround the implementation of the Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965. Historically, a gap has existed in accrediting, but it was not acknowledged as such until the attempts to enforce this Act made clear both the inequities of the accrediting process and the refusal of many agencies to identify with occupational training beyond the high school. Since some of the provisions for institutional eligibility for participation in this program are the same as those specified in the Nurse Training Act, parallels could be drawn except for one fact: Because it is viewed as a professional training program, nursing education has captured the attention of the academic community. This has not been true for programs offered in the realm of postsecondary education which do not necessarily culminate in a degree.

As a consequence of the need to implement the Student Loan Insurance Act as quickly as possible, alternate voluntary accrediting procedures were introduced, geared to state-level activity. Writing in a staff report early in 1967, Robert Fischer of NCA stated,

> The higher education community in one sense faces a *fait accompli*. Its chances of reversing the trend established by the advisory committee must be assessed . . . Time is of the essence if we are to retain voluntary accrediting and are to keep accrediting a function of the institutions, the professions and the technical areas.

The current thrust, then, must be directed toward gaining agreement that voluntary accreditation for the entire spectrum of institutions concerned with postsecondary vocational-technical education, irrespective of their degree-granting status, is a legitimate and viable goal. To be effective, however, this movement will have to be structured in a positive frame, and not in response to the much expressed fear that, "If we don't do it, the Federal government will."

The confusion of the last two years must be placed against the failure of the accrediting movement to become universal. It is a basic premise of the present study that in the interests of bringing all institutions under the umbrella of voluntary accreditation, the regional accrediting associations will have to rise above their self-imposed dilemma based upon the college level vs. noncollege level dichotomy. The following policy statement, adopted early in 1968 by the North Central Association, the largest of the regional accrediting agencies, makes it clear, however, that still another criterion is being used--whether an institution is operated for profit or not:

> The Commission requires that the institution [offering technical-vocation programs] be chartered and operated on a not-for-profit basis. Further, the institution must award an authorized degree upon completion of a program of study.

(While a subsequent acknowledgment grants institutions the option of offering some programs which do not culminate in a degree, this option is alluded to as a distinctly secondary alternative.)

The major concern of the regional association about accrediting vocational programs seems entwined with the question of the value of general education and the fear that professionally accredited programs will bypass the liberal arts entirely. There can be no question of the importance of general education. In practice, barring noncollege level and profit-based institutions from peer or voluntary accreditation substantially reduces the chances that general education courses will be introduced into their programs. Norman Harris (1968), one of this country's leading authorities on technical education, refers to schools so excluded as having been relegated to a "twilight zone," somewhere between secondary-level trade schools and collegiate-level technical institutes.

It seems clear, therefore, that the present controversy on accreditation has shifted focus. The research reported on in this document indicates that the fears of proliferation of specialized accrediting activities, precipitated by the Nurse Training Act, was not borne out by events. The critical issue at present is the definition of the role of voluntary accrediting machinery already in existence. Harris (1968) stated:

> If these schools [technical] are not interested in upgrading and broadening their programs to the point where accreditation as a two-year college is indicated, the regional higher education commissions should decline to become involved. The 'accreditation' of area vocational schools focusing only on secondary and non-collegiate levels could perhaps best be done by state departments of education. The prestige and status which comes with accreditation by a regional association must be earned, not handed out indiscriminately. Accreditation as a college is granted to educational institutions, not to job training centers, essential though the latter may be.

This stand, however popular, does not seem to be translatable into a program of state accreditation. Even with enabling legislation, states have not moved toward additional accrediting activity. At a time when voluntary accreditation could move rapidly to fill a true social need, state government agencies evidently are reaffirming their faith in the concept of voluntary accreditation by not accepting a possible role, which therefore will have to be filled by another agency.

While tension in two-year institutions has been reduced by recent modification of the Nurse Training Act, it has become apparent that the feeling was symptomatic of other and more basic anxieties related to accreditation and the role of the two-year college. The most dynamic force during this period of readjustment and reclarification has been, and rightly so, the National Commission on Accrediting. This body has not only provided the necessary leadership, but has provided the stability without which issues cannot be explored or directions defined.

Recent Events: 1965 and 1966

In January of 1965, a resolution was passed by the American Association of Junior Colleges which instructed their representative on the board of the National Commission on Accrediting:

> To secure NCA initiative and leadership to reconcile and to systematize the diverse elements and organizations in specialized and general accreditation . . .

Later that year, the National Commission surveyed its own members to determine their attitudes toward the accrediting process, and found overwhelming support for the continuance of both general and specialized accreditation (91 percent). One of the more enlightening statistics reported was that, of those queried, 81 percent of the junior colleges as against 53 percent of the universities and four-year colleges favored regional accreditation exclusively for Federal funding. All of the institutions agreed, however, on the desirability of specialized accreditation for programs in two-year colleges, noteworthy in light of the Commission's finding that most of the specialized activity is known to take place at the four-year college level.

In his 1966 annual report, Frank Dickey, Executive Director of the National Commission on Accrediting, expressed the problem as it related to the junior college, and made clear the Commission's commitment and concern:

> The most basic question is that of how to encourage flexibility, experimentation, and innovation in the operation of those junior and community college programs and at the same time maintain quality and a reasonable degree of uniformity. The perfect balance will probably never be achieved, but further delay in formulating and adopting revised policies will only result in more chaotic conditions in the future.

The Center's study was undertaken shortly after the NCA's commitment to explore the question of accreditation as it relates to the two-year college. After the present study was undertaken in 1966, a number of forces became more deeply involved in the problem of accreditation: Not only were the Public Health Service and the U. S. Office of Education applying pressure to relax the regulations of the Nurse Training Act, but increased interest and activity in general were generated both by the survey instruments and interviews used in the Center study and the findings of the recently completed NCA self-study. In addition, the role of the regional association was being analyzed and an assessment of the effectiveness of the Federation of regional accrediting agencies was being prepared. It was at this point that the National Commission acted.

Late in 1966, the Commission released a staff position paper which acknowledged a concern for proper and progressive development of quality education at the junior college level and asserted its confidence in the integrity and capability of junior college educators and the colleges themselves. Within this framework of support, the Commission expressed the necessity for a degree of institutional self-direction not possible through provisions of the then existing Nurse Training Act. It regarded the procedures outlined in the Nurse Training Act as not providing the junior colleges "with that degree of flexibility for program development which the Commission regards as being harmonious with the American tradition of higher education."

To insure both flexibility for junior colleges as they developed quality programs, and safeguards of public and governmental interests, the Commission proposed a "cooperative approach," whereby the junior college seeking Federal funding could choose between expanded regional accreditation and specialized accreditation. In explaining and reinforcing the cooperative approach, the Commission strongly opposed the use of specialized accreditation as a sole criterion for eligibility for Federal funds, and offered to work with AAJC to provide a list of recognized consulting associations.

Recent Events: 1967 and 1968

In January of 1967, the National Commission on Accrediting issued another paper, generally concerned with the subject of extending accrediting activity to all postsecondary education. Two central points were:

> (1) If predictions are correct, the time will arrive when it will be increasingly difficult to distinguish technical education from certain areas of collegiate education and the differences between proprietary and nonprofit schools will become fewer and fewer.
>
> (2) One part of higher education cannot be considered within the domain of voluntary accrediting and another segment considered to be beyond the interest or concern of our Commission.

A major proposal made was that two divisions be created within the Commission, one to continue the Commission's original accrediting activities, and the other to serve as a council on postsecondary specialized institutions offering instruction in technical or vocational education and in professional areas not ordinarily included in college or university patterns. This constituted the first official attempt to provide a base of operation for Harris's (1964) "twilight zone" institutions.

The Executive Committee of the Commission viewed the proposed cooperative approach with favor but rejected the notion of expansion to two divisions. It urged instead that the regional associations and their Federation develop the machinery for permitting the participation of postsecondary specialized institutions within the regional association framework. Eager to forestall the approval of additional accrediting agencies by the U.S. Commissioner, the NCA Executive Committee asked for early reactions from the regional associations.

This charge to the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions, calling for a major shift in policy, was formally accepted by the Federation on April 1, and the major effort to reorganize and reorient the accrediting movement at the post high school level was under way. In the annual report presented at the same meeting, the Director of NCA noted the significance of the task before it: "The question to which the National Commission on Accrediting must address itself is . . . how important [is] the business of retaining the concept of voluntary accreditation to the future of higher education in this nation."

To attempt closure on at least one section of the problem, the NCA subsequently endorsed the following procedure: When attempting to establish the eligibility of programs for Federal funding through regional accreditation, institutions granting an associate degree would be permitted to draw on the specialized agencies for guidelines and accrediting personnel. The Commission rejected at the time a corollary proposal regarding the assessment of eligibility of nursing programs, which would have permitted the colleges themselves to determine where to seek accreditation.

While this accelerated activity was taking place to forestall proliferation of accrediting agencies through some action of the Federal government, the issue of comprehensive accreditation was also receiving increased attention. As a result of the position taken by the NCA on the necessity for accreditation for the entire spectrum of higher education, the Federation took a stand. In October of 1967, the FRACHE group acknowledged the existence of a problem in accreditation for vocational education, and moved to provide direction. The Federation proposed a National Committee for Occupational Education, composed of members from both NCA and FRACHE, which would serve to recognize accrediting agencies and associations for specialized institutions offering occupational education. This committee was visualized as a device to close the gap in accreditation, the earlier accrediting activity of the NCA having left the specialized institutions and non-degree programs without an accrediting base. The proposal was not well received, however, the predominant feeling being that the National Commission should accept the responsibility for surveillance of accrediting activity in the vocational-technical area.

As a consequence of the unacceptability of the FRACHE proposal, the National Commission found itself, late in November 1967, back in the middle of the controversy, and by early the next year it issued a report, summarized in the statement:

> In order to forestall, then, further drift of the determination of accreditation matters by the Federal and state governments, it is hereby proposed that the National Commission on Accrediting be reorganized for the purpose of serving as the overall leader in the coordination, planning, and vitalization of accreditation in postsecondary education.

At the conclusion of the annual meeting, April 1, 1968, the Board of Commissioners of NCA "unanimously adopted a resolution authorizing the staff and a special committee . . . to determine a structure for accrediting in the United States which would afford more coordination and consistency." Implied in the motion was the hope that some organizational pattern could be developed which would encompass in one administrative structure the various agencies in vocational-technical education, the Federation, and NCA.

Efforts to structure the accreditation coordinating process continue to date. A series of meetings have been held by various groups; the Federation has endorsed the proposal that, after reorganization, the NCA will serve as the overall coordinating leader; and each of the regional associations has committed itself to developing some means of accrediting postsecondary vocational institutions, exclusive of colleges, that could be classified as nonprofit. As matters stood in fall of 1968, however, they seemed to be in direct opposition to the North Central Association's coolness toward accreditation of non-degree programs. The resolution of this conflict is, of course, still a principal concern.

During this most crucial period, in the spring of 1968 the U. S. Office of Education also undertook the major task of coordinating its activities related to the approval of accrediting agencies and the certification of colleges, universities, and vocational schools for participation in Federal education programs. Among the major steps taken was the appointment of a national advisory committee on matters pertaining to accreditation and institutional eligibility, and the establishment of a new unit in the Bureau of Higher Education, titled the Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility staff. The person chosen to lead the new unit was, at the time of his appointment, the Assistant Director of NCA, John R. Proffitt. The advisory committee met twice during 1968 and among other steps recommended two sets of criteria, one for nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations, and the other for state agencies to approve nurse education. Both lists were approved by the Commissioner and were published in the Federal Register on January 16, 1969.

Almost forgotten in the concentrated accrediting activity, which had broadened to focus on the entire spectrum of vocational-technical education, was the precipitating factor of concern, the Nurse Training Act. The Act was in fact amended on August 16, 1968, and included changes of major significance for the accreditation process. Nursing programs will henceforth be accredited either through program accreditation by the National League for Nursing or through accreditation of the institution as a whole by a regional accrediting association, a state agency, or some other recognized accrediting body. This expanded definition for purposes of funding will make it possible for some 500 previously excluded nursing programs to participate in the benefits of the Act, and thus must be regarded as a critical development in the history of the accreditation movement.

The legislation related to the Nurse Training Act had served as a catalyst for defining and dealing with the major underlying problems of accreditation, and although the resolution of that crisis was welcome, it did not ultimately diminish the larger necessity for understanding and dealing with the broadest implications of accreditation procedures for the two-year college.

CHAPTER III

THE PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION AND ITS ACCREDITING FUNCTION

The existence of two types of voluntary accreditation in the United States has come to be regarded as generally beneficial to higher education. It has frequently been pointed out that while specialized accreditation has acted as a safeguard of health and welfare, regional accreditation has had the effect of upgrading programs and institutions. Each of the procedures produces a certain set of problems; our concern here is with those related to accreditation by the professional association.

The Professional Association

Any attempt to define the problems and issues in specialized accreditation must, of course, begin with an understanding of the professional association itself. When individuals in a particular work group give formal recognition to the fact that they are using a common body of knowledge that can be communicated through education, they have formed a professional association. Because there are now literally scores of professions, and the process of proliferation, as well as the new technology, will increase their number, there have been many attempts to classify, identify, and codify them. Carr-Saunders and Wilson(1962), for instance, attempted to differentiate between the vocational organization and the professional association, and concluded that the latter represents an intellectual technique. By extension, the mark of the professional individual is command of an intellectual technique acquired by special training and applicable to some sphere of everyday life.

Goode (1957) has attempted to put the professional association into a framework of a "community" with control over training and professional behavior, the professions usually requiring higher standards than the law. Strauss (1963) feels that a profession requires: knowledge and skills usually attained through an academic program; autonomy--the right to decide, in freedom from lay restriction, how the function is to be performed; commitment to the calling; and responsibility to society for the maintenance of professional standards of work. To Greenwood (1962), a profession is an organized group in constant interaction with the society that forms its matrix, distinguished by a systematic theory, authority, community sanction, an ethical code, and a culture.

Wilensky's (1964) view is that the traditional model of autonomous expertise and the service ideal constitutes the most essential criterion for true professionalism, and that this standard, strictly imposed, rules out many organizations that claim professional status. This is in contrast to the bureaucratic model, based on a pyramidal order of authority. Occupational groups of the future may well combine elements of both the professional and the bureaucratic models. Transformation of the working group into an organization basically modeled on the professional organization is central to the purposes of specialized accreditation, since subsequently such an organization could be expected to assume other functions of the professional organization, such as establishing standards of training and controlling entry into the work force.

Professionalization and Entry Level Skills

When the American Medical Association was formed in 1847, the doctor of medicine degree was awarded, on occasion, after less than six months of training, and entry into the profession was not predicated on quantifiable skills or standards of training. Writing about the status of professional education at the time, Blauch (1959) stated:

> With notable exceptions, education for the professions near the close of the 19th century was in a sad state. Most of the professional schools were poorly housed and almost never in quarters designed for professional instruction. Their only income was from student fees, which covered the cost of operation and provided a profit for the owner. The entrance requirements were few and low. The majority of students could not have been admitted to colleges requiring entrance tests. The courses were almost entirely didactic.

The conditions outlined by Blauch were particularly applicable to medical education, and the AMA undertook a project of educational reform underwritten by a grant from the Carnegie Foundation. The "Flexner Report" (1910) which resulted not only set the stage for major reform in medical education, but established a precedent which most professions have attempted to follow.

The subsequent reform movement had as its goal the strengthening of professions, and this activity came to be called specialized accreditation. It took place for the most part outside of institutions of higher education, and was initiated by the professions themselves to compensate for the failure of institutions to upgrade their professional programs.

One area to which the professional organizations turned was that of standards for admissions. Control over the type of person who enters a program is especially crucial to new professional associations striving for recognition and prestige, and it holds equal priority with the establishment of the level of skill necessary for initial employment. When the training program is seen as serving the dual purpose of imparting the skills and also the social values and behavior norms of the occupational group, then it inevitably serves to identify and screen out prospective deviants from that culture.

The problem of requirements for entry to training programs has long plagued post high school institutions, since it involves establishing a selective balance between professional needs and institutional goals. One result of the inability of the institution to resolve this issue effectively has been the involvement of some of the professions, such as the allied health professions, in designating entry level requirements.

The Professional Accrediting Agency and the National Commission on Accrediting

It seems clear that some standardization of programs within American higher education was necessary, and the two types of voluntary accrediting activity that emerged simply took different paths to meet the same concerns--about educational quality, order, and standards. But this emphasis on standardization in time gave rise to anxiety about the extent to which attention to standards might override interest in innovation, diversity, and autonomy. It was this growing concern, and the institutional clamor accompanying it, that precipitated the formation of the National Commission on Accrediting.

Immediately following the turn of the century, standards were developed by regional associations and the professions renewed their efforts to raise professional standards and establish educational criteria. Other occupational groups followed suit during the 1920s, and by the mid-1930s many of the groups, with assistance in a number of instances from foundations and state licensing agencies, had adopted the process of formal accreditation--a major factor in their professionalization.

Reaction to this accrediting movement was swift and vocal. University presidents who saw their institutions being split by the actions of competing professional societies and organizations instituted a "counter revolution," as Selden (1960) called it, which reached a climax in 1938, a decade before the formation of NCA. A Joint Committee on Accrediting was formed to prepare a list of accrediting agencies with which the member institutions would be encouraged to cooperate. As mandated by the founding associations, "...the committee should direct itself, among other things, toward an elimination of some of the procedures, reduction of duplication, removal of dictation from groups outside the educational field, and restoration of responsibility to states and institutions." These functions were almost identical to those proposed later for the National Commission. The concerns of the Joint Committee in 1938 were, in essence, the concerns of the National Commission on Accrediting in 1949.

The National Commission on Accrediting

In its decade of service, the Joint Committee on Accrediting was moderately successful; it denied accrediting privileges to some organizations, dissuaded others from accrediting, and then moved in the direction of guiding institutions toward improving their programs.

The format it adopted was to issue a list of agencies with which institutions had been cooperating, with the request that institutions cooperate with no new groups until they had been investigated. This procedure was only moderately successful, and when the American Association of Universities abandoned its accrediting effort in 1948, the Joint Committee ceased to function. It then devolved solely upon the regional associations to combat the proliferation of specialized agencies, and since only four of the regionals were at that time actively engaged in accrediting activity, college presidents sought new techniques to regulate accreditation. In 1949, out of the remaining nucleus of the Joint Committee on Accrediting, the National Commission on Accrediting was formed. As phrased in a 1965 report on the past and future of NCA, the commission was "Conceived by dissatisfaction, born out of chaos and reared in confusion." It nevertheless has existed for twenty years, during which it has patiently attempted to coordinate a national frame of reference within which to deal with the problems related to the specialized accrediting agency.

The chairman of the new commission was Reuben Gustavson, then chancellor of the University of Nebraska, and past chairman of the Joint Committee. The concern expressed in the first meeting was twofold: "First, what type of accrediting are we going to set up to protect the cultural or liberal arts work? And second, what can be done to stem the serious inroads of administrative authority and freedom of action that result from the separate uncoordinated and sometimes unreasonable demands of the more than forty specialized accrediting associations?"

In 1950, the dilemma posed by specialized vs. regional accreditation was characterized in a report as follows:

> One may view a university as an arrangement for expediting administration of autonomous faculties, or it may be viewed as an institution that has purposes and values greater than the sum of its parts. Under the first view, we shall have segmental accrediting. Under the second, we shall have institution-wide accrediting. Who is to decide what a university is?

Attempting to answer this question, the commission resolved to have the specialized agency serve as advisor to the regional association, and requested that the agencies reduce or eliminate their direct accrediting activities in the various institutions. Two factors militated against success: The commission lacked a mandate by law, and many felt it also lacked the mantle of legitimacy.

In 1951, the American Association of Junior Colleges became the seventh constituent member of the National Commission on Accrediting, thus making any AAJC member eligible to join the NCA. By 1956, the commission had a membership of 640 institutions.

Early Difficulties of the Commission

The success of the commission's direction hinged on the support of its members, and for reasons which became painfully obvious, the support was not forthcoming. Although the commission represented the thinking of many administrators, it found that it did not speak for numerous faculty members who supported the various professional associations. One faculty committee urged against any change because, "On the whole, society and the interests of institutions are better served by the present scheme than by the one proposed by the commission." Two months before the deadline for implementing the first recommendations, the executive committee of the NCA announced that the deadline was superseded.

After this inauspicious beginning, the commission placed major responsibility for accreditation on the regional association; all agencies were expected to improve and coordinate their own activities. Even though the specialized agencies proved more resilient than many had predicted, the commission set a tone and made an impact which is becoming increasingly apparent. During that early period, it sought for a consensus on a philosophy of accreditation, endeavored to stimulate improved accreditation, and became the center for communications about accreditation regulations. This period of trial and error in the early 1950s set the stage for what is now the largest institutional membership organization in education.

The Specialized Agency and the Community College

Once the community college began making an impact as a training agency in fields other than the trades, it became of interest to the professional association. The attraction was mutual; students, instructors, and administrators of these pre-professional programs were interested in the status aspects of professional accreditation.

In the decade after AAJC joined the National Commission, most of the specialized accrediting involved institutions with highly developed programs in special areas, such as engineering or dental hygiene. By 1961, however, the American Association of Junior Colleges began to become concerned about specialized accreditation, there being a general feeling that "the pressure for accreditation of certain specialized programs of study are bound to increase." Although the report of a study team indicated a minimum of activity by specialized agencies, the community colleges were not convinced, and each year since 1961 the American Association of Junior Colleges has issued a formal statement, usually in the form of a resolution, asking for a clarification of the problem.

With the passage of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, the two-year colleges became directly involved with specialized accreditation (see Chapter II). Because of the language of the law, the community colleges offering associate degree nursing programs were not eligible for funding unless they were accredited by a "recognized body" approved by the Commissioner of Education. Under previous legislation requiring accreditation, such as the Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1957 (the G. I. Bill), approval by the U. S. Office of Education, a regional or state accrediting agency, or a licensing body was considered adequate. The 1963 legislation was of major importance to the community colleges because for the first time funding was tied to an accredited status which was specific and defined; criteria were established for acceptability and specialized accrediting agencies were designated. This decision was upheld in 1964 when the Nurse Training Act was passed.

Shortly after the National League for Nursing was officially designated as the recognized body to accredit nursing programs under the 1964 Nurse Training Act, the executive director of AAJC responded by requesting the National Commission on Accrediting to urge regional accrediting associations:

> . . .to initiate a careful study of specialized accreditation and the implications for general accreditation of junior colleges to the end that all institutions and agencies concerned can most effectively and cooperatively utilize their special talents and resources.

There was a general feeling that the community college was about to become involved in the pattern of proliferation which had gone on two decades before in the four-year colleges and universities. Since many of these two-year colleges were constantly expanding their offerings in the pre-professional areas, it was possible to sympathize with their concerns, although at the time their anxiety seemed unfounded.

Specialized Accrediting Activity in the Community College

One consequence of its lengthy orientation to the public school program was that the two-year colleges were slow to seek accredited status. It was not until the 1950s that community colleges began to seek regional accreditation in any numbers. If regional accreditation came slowly, accreditation of specific programs came even more slowly, and fears of proliferation still seemed based on anxious projections rather than facts.

The 1961 study carried out by the NCA at the request of the AAJC yielded the following information about groups that had begun to accredit non-baccalaureate degree programs:

> Business
>
> The American Association of Schools of Business (the accrediting agency recognized by NCA) did not accredit in the community college. The Accrediting Commission for Business Schools, however, which was not on the approved list, accredited junior colleges and noncollegiate schools of business, including those operated for profit. The statement was made that "when regional accrediting agencies have extended their services to include junior colleges, the Commission will not receive and act upon institutions in this classification."
>
> Dentistry
>
> The American Dental Association, recognized by NCA to determine and apply criteria to educational programs for dental personnel, was accrediting training programs for technicians in 1961. The accredited programs included two for dental hygienists, one for dental laboratory technicians, and 15 for dental assistants. Although training for dental assisting was a two-year curriculum, it was offered by universities and technical institutes as well as by community colleges.
>
> Engineering
>
> In 1944, because of the great need for technically trained personnel, engineering associations concerned with technical institutes created a committee which published its first list of accredited institutions in 1946. By 1961 there were 40 accredited technical institute programs offered by junior colleges, universities, and educational divisions of industrial concerns, as well as by proprietary institutions. Often two or more of these programs were in the same institution. Six community colleges had accredited programs.
>
> Medicine
>
> The Council on Medical Education has a history of concern about the training in auxiliary medical fields. By 1961, there were 21 accredited medical technology programs operating in two-year colleges.
>
> Nursing
>
> Three types of programs were offered in nursing education: diploma programs, baccalaureate and higher degree programs, and associate programs. Fifty of the 60 associate

> degree programs were found in junior colleges, but only three had formal accreditation from the National League for Nursing.

The 1961 study team concluded from this overview that: "Only a few of those accrediting agencies are interested, as far as accreditation is involved, in programs of study offered by junior colleges." The report included the prediction, however, that the drive for specialized accreditation was bound to increase.

Accrediting activity in 1961 clearly did not involve large numbers of institutions, but the pressure felt by the various colleges was not without precedent. In the mid-1930s, for example, when the Joint Committee on Accrediting asked that colleges not seek accreditation from the American Chemical Society, the presidents of many universities found that not only were some of their programs already accredited, but that faculty support for accreditation was extremely strong. A major decision was forced upon administrators: Should they uphold the ethical stance of the Joint Committee and refuse to become involved with ACS, or should they accede to the desires of the faculty to participate?

The situation in 1961 was clear. One hundred and twenty-nine programs to train technicians were found in community colleges, technical institutes, and four-year colleges. Of these programs, approximately one-third were located in two-year colleges, primarily in the area of medical technology. Of the total number of accredited programs, however, only two had the sanction of the National Commission.

Current Accrediting Activity in the Community College

In January of 1967, the present study surveyed the extent to which specialized accrediting groups had moved into the community college. In addition to the six regional accrediting associations which, of course, still granted only institutional accreditation, the number of agencies approved by the National Commission had expanded from 23 to 28, and these were contacted and asked two basic questions: Do you now accredit programs of training in the community-junior colleges (whether recognized by NCA to do so or not)? What are the plans of your association in regard to accrediting activity at the community college level in the immediate (next five years) future?

Six of the agencies approved by NCA were excluded from this study because of their specific nature: Dentistry (programs leading to DDS or DMD degrees); Law (professional schools only); Medicine (programs leading to MD degrees); Psychology (Ph.D. programs in clinical and counseling psychology); Theology (graduate professional schools); and Veterinary Medicine (schools offering DMV or VMD programs). Twenty of the 22 agencies contacted replied to the original inquiry, and most of them supplied supporting data about their role and function. It was assumed that the nonresponding agencies, the National Association of Schools of Art and the American Speech and Hearing Association, neither accredited nor had strong interest in prebaccalaureate programs.

The 20 accrediting bodies that reported were represented by 17 agencies, and the responses of their executive officers were grouped into three categories (Table 1).* The finding was that of the 17 organizations, five were engaged in accrediting activity, including the Council on Medical Education, which accredits four separate training programs at the community college level. Four of the organizations had discussed the community college issue but had no plans to accredit within the next five years. The eight remaining agencies indicated that they did not engage in accrediting activity at the two-year college level, and had not discussed the possibility of doing so.

---

*Tables referred to throughout the study appear in Appendix F.

The survey indicated, then, that of 28 organizations recognized by NCA to accredit specific programs, only five had accredited community college programs: the Council on Dental Education; the Engineers' Council for Professional Development; the Council on Medical Education; the National Association of Schools of Music; and the National League for Nursing. Only two had the sanction of NCA to accredit programs at this level: the American Dental Association and the National Association of Schools of Music. NCA had acknowledged, but not acted on, the need for accreditation of engineering technology programs and associate degree programs of nursing; it has since approved the nursing and engineering programs. The other agencies now accrediting programs do so with the knowledge of the NCA, but without their sanction. Five accrediting organizations were found to have an interest in ten specified training programs (Table 2).

Medicine The Council on Medical Education has established accrediting procedures in four fields of training found in community colleges. These programs in x-ray technology, medical record technology, inhalation therapy, and cytotechnology have been developed over the part 15 years. Of the 1090 approved programs of training, 51 (less than five percent) were found in 48 community colleges. Three two-year colleges supported approved programs in two of the four areas of training.

Dentistry The Council on Dental Education, representing the concerns of the American Dental Association, accredited or approved programs in three areas: dental laboratory technology, dental assisting, and dental hygiene. These three types of training programs (a total of 61) were found in 55 community colleges. Six community colleges supported approved programs in at least two areas, but no community college supported all three.

Nursing The Federal legislation defining criteria for financial assistance complicated the problem of the relationship between the community college and nurse training programs. Prior to the passage of the first health-related legislation in 1963, there were six accredited associate degree programs, half of them in community colleges. To permit a greater number of institutions to qualify for financial assistance under the Federal legislation, a new category of "reasonable assurance" was established. Under this rubric, it was possible to include institutions which had not yet fulfilled the conditions for qualification, but were deemed to be moving in that direction. Many junior colleges have taken advantage of the reasonable assurance stipulation, but as of November 1, 1966, only six had received full NLN accreditation. Of the 203 associate degree nursing programs in operation, primarily in two-year colleges, 91 had either full accreditation or the provisional accreditation given to programs which had been given "reasonable assurance." An additional 23 had been denied because they lacked regional accreditation.

Engineering The Engineers' Council for Professional Development became interested in accrediting training programs in community colleges in the 1940s. In November, 1966, it listed 33 separate programs of training in nine institutions entered in the 1967 American Association of Junior Colleges Directory. Approved programs or curricula varied from one to six per institution.

Music In December of 1966, the National Association of Schools of Music had ten community college members and stated, "To the extent that membership constitutes accreditation those institutions are accredited." The association does not accredit programs of study at this level, but does establish criteria for membership. Although it deviates from the usual accrediting procedure, the NASM has the clearest criteria for membership of any of the agencies currently concerned with the two-year college.

In sum, of the 837 junior colleges listed in the 1967 American Association of Junior Colleges Directory, 102 had one or more programs accredited by specialized accrediting agencies, including a significant number provisionally accredited under the National League for Nursing's "reasonable assurance" clause. The total represents about 12 percent of the community junior colleges listed in the 1967 AAJC Directory. Despite the increase in the number of institutions established, the increase in accrediting activity (with the exception of that done under the reasonable assurance category of NLN) has been very slight since the study requested by AAJC of NCA in 1961. In 1962, the NCA study team reported:

> From this description of the extent of accreditation of junior colleges by professional or specialized agencies, it can be seen that only a small percentage of the AAJC membership are presently and directly concerned with any accreditation other than that conducted by the regional associations or by the respective state officials.

This situation has not changed significantly. The organizations which were accrediting in 1961 are still involved, but some have reduced their activity, except in the health-related fields, and in engineering in one instance.

Accrediting Agencies on Basic Issues

The five agencies which indicated, in response to a preliminary query, that they accredited programs at the two-year college level (Medicine, Dentistry, Engineering, Nursing and Music), were surveyed for the present study on the following issues: attitude toward, and level of accrediting activity; cooperative role and expanded representation; licensure and entry level; and institutional relationships.

All five agencies had a history of interest in the community college, and had been engaged in accrediting programs at the prebaccalaureate level for some years. Although only two of the five had received NCA approval to accredit programs, the other three had community college members and continued to solicit from this group.

Several of the regional associations and two of the specialized agencies had been forced to formulate similar new categories of accreditation. The National League for Nursing's category of "reasonable assurance," for new programs not yet able to meet the established criteria, was essentially matched by the "candidate for accreditation" category established by the Engineers' Council for Professional Development. The regional associations have also taken steps in this direction of giving recognition to newly established institutions.

There was general agreement among the agencies that some modification of their procedures was necessary to allow for more cooperation with the six regional associations. Some specialized agencies also indicated a readiness to make internal changes. For example, the Council on Dental Education showed interest in establishing standards for two new programs, while the Engineers' Council for Professional Development tended toward a single program in engineering technology (as opposed to the concept of field concentration). In general, however, the agencies leaned more toward a new look of cooperation than toward any radical internal changes.

The specialized agencies did not reject the idea of a dual system of accreditation, involving both the regional and specialized agencies in cooperative site visits, but they were cautious. There was concern that this move might be used as a device to place the specialized agency purely in the role of consultant. As one agency representative stated, "While we wish to cooperate, we reaffirm our continuing responsibility to the profession to conduct specialized evaluation for those institutions which perceive a need for this type of accreditation."

The problems associated with joint site visits were seen as real but mechanical problems amenable to solution. A typical response was: "The logistics and mechanics of scheduling, the problem of policy governing intervals between visits, the problem of evaluating a new program in an institution already accredited and not due for accreditation

...all of these and other practical problems will tax the ingenuity of all the staffs of all agencies." While concerned about these and other problems, the various agencies nevertheless indicated a desire to move into a new phase of expanded interaction with other voluntary groups.

One source of some concern to the various specialized agencies over the years has been the organizational structure of the National Commission on Accrediting. Since it is a body that represents institutions, the agencies have never had direct representation. In 1965, John R. Mayor suggested a modification of the council membership, with specific reference to teacher education. The agencies felt that this representation would be good for the movement, and could serve to bring the agency and the institution closer together. The executive officer of one accrediting agency explained:

> It seems reasonable to suggest, under the principle of 'government by the consent of the governed' that the NCA should include in its governing structure representatives of the professional agencies.

With respect to the problem of licensure, which is state-controlled, the response of the agencies was that their own accrediting standard was the more important criterion. The agencies cooperate fully with the state licensing agencies, but note little relationship between their activities, except to the extent that the licensing board uses accreditation by an agency as a primary condition for eligibility.

When asked about the possibility of substituting comprehensive national licensure laws for accredited status, the reaction of the agencies was consistently negative. They felt that licensing bodies were both provincial and political and that, since most were political appointments subject to continuing change and modification, they would oppose any expanded licensing activity. As the executive officer of the dental group stated:

> It seems that the dental profession is moving more in the direction of substituting educational evaluation of the practitioner at the completion of professional training, than it is toward development of a comprehensive national exam.

Although nursing has developed a national examination, decisions about its use and the range of acceptable scores are made by the various state licensing boards. Unlike the picture on the national scene, there was a sense of a distinct lessening of licensing activity at the state level.

The question of entry level skill is also related to licensure. Interestingly enough, most of the specialized agencies were unable to define or quantify the levels of skill necessary to perform jobs adequately. The National Association of Schools of Music did specify necessary skills in concrete terms, but the other groups felt that level of skill could be judged on the basis of graduation from an accredited school and a passing grade on a state licensing examination. The inability to agree upon skills necessary for satisfactory job performance is common among the various specialized agencies, and at least two of the agencies did not see the possibility of any move toward quantification. To a question about how they viewed their responsibilities, the agencies responded with a strong expression of commitment to the competence of students being trained by the institution. They felt themselves primarily responsible to the profession.

The agencies saw no conflict of interest between their activities and those of the institution. Accrediting bodies evidently accept the integrity of the institution, seem interested in working within that framework, and in general, attempt to apply their criteria in the light of institutional objectives. As one executive secretary stated, "Council accrediting committees make every reasonable effort not to intrude upon or interfere with an institution's freedom and right of independent action and decision." Another agency representative also stated, "It does not seem that an accrediting agency's activities are necessarily in conflict with independent institutional self-concepts."

Support of institutional rights was not unanimous, however; at least one agency felt that its organization's expertise was necessary in making decisions about the direction programs should take. While this attitude was certainly in the minority, it is an indication that the community college's anxiety about possible infringements on autonomy were not wholly unfounded.

Although the specialized agencies have not, for the most part, viewed themselves as setting policy, but rather as assisting institutions to fulfill their commitments, the two-year colleges have not been reassured.

The AAJC has two basic concerns about accreditation by specialized agencies; these relate to cost and the proliferation of accrediting agencies. There is a fear that the junior colleges will not only be subjected to significant costs relating to accreditation, but that as the technologies develop, the number of agencies will increase and institutions will be inundated with requests to accredit. The anxieties of the four-year college with respect to specialized accreditation had a somewhat different focus--fears of loss of identity and autonomy and/or institutional integrity. While these are also continuing concerns of the junior colleges, they are no longer central.

Summary

Work groups have historically sought means of upgrading themselves and increasing the prestige of their membership; the specialized accrediting agency is an outgrowth of this impulse to upgrade.

The expansion of the accrediting agencies and their increased interest in the two-year colleges has been a source of continuing anxiety to those institutions. In an attempt to place some of these concerns in proper focus, a survey was made of the 22 accrediting agencies that could have had an interest in two-year college programs. When the results of this survey were compared with those of a survey conducted under the auspices of the National Commission on Accrediting in 1961, little change in the level of accrediting activity was found. In only one instance, the field of nursing, had accrediting activity increased. While part of that increased activity can be attributed to the formation of a Department of Associate Degree Nursing Programs, the greatest amount is a direct result of Federal legislation which uses accreditation as a criterion of eligibility for funding.

The five agencies currently accrediting programs indicated an increase in cooperation with other accrediting groups, but not a great increase in the level of accrediting activity. Instead, they saw a movement toward giving more assistance to the various memberships.

While the specialized agencies were willing to cooperate with the various regional associations, they were cautious about committing themselves to a role that might be reduced to that of consultant, and continued to insist upon the privilege of accrediting those programs concerned with their professions. The agencies were not precise, however, about the level of skills necessary for employment, and with one exception have not been able to specify specific skills needed for entrance into various work groups.

AAJC continues its opposition to specialized accreditation at the two-year college level, feeling that regional accreditation is an adequate assessment of program quality. It is currently asking the regional accrediting agencies to expand their efforts at this level. Relatively few organizations which accredit programs have the sanction of NCA; the largest number of accredited programs in the community colleges represent organizations which accredit without the sanction of NCA. Perhaps this inability to gain grass roots support for their stand on this issue constitutes an important segment of the overall problem now confronting both NCA and AAJC

The history of work groups leads one to expect that new associations will continue to form and that these associations will attempt to establish criteria for new group members, thus increasing the threat of an unwieldy proliferation of accrediting activity. The existence of the National Commission on Accrediting, however, gives the two-year college a great advantage in working out the problems associated with this continuing growth.

Community college projections about difficulties that would arise from the increased activity of specialized agencies have not materialized, and methods have been developed for keeping proliferation from becoming a larger problem in the future.

CHAPTER IV

THE INSTITUTION AND THE ACCREDITING AGENCY

The other principal goal of this study was to determine how the institutions interpreted the agencies' activities and generally responded to the process of accreditation.

A questionnaire (Appendix B) was developed to elicit opinions about the value of accreditation as perceived by the institution, or more specifically, by staff and faculty involved in vocational-technical education.

The institutions that comprised the final sample were stratified into three groups. Group I included comprehensive community colleges with regional accreditation only, Group II included comprehensive community colleges accredited by both regional and specialized agencies, and Group III was composed of special purpose institutions, primarily technical institutes, with specialized accreditation. Group I and II institutions were randomly selected, but those in Group III were included on the basis of a mail survey of various individuals knowledgeable about technical education.

The respondents within each school or college, ranging from presidents to faculty members in vocational-technical education divisions, were categorized into four general classes according to institutional responsibility. The questionnaire was administered in order to establish the attitudinal set of the respondents and to provide them with the opportunity to make statements explaining their points of view about various aspects of accreditation. It was hoped that from this preliminary exploration of opinions and attitudes a direction for future investigation would emerge.

Specifically, expressions of attitudes were sought that could be expected to shed light on the following areas:

1) How is the regional accrediting association perceived by individuals in two-year colleges?

2) To what extent are the regional associations assessing vocational-technical programs in their evaluation of the total institution?

3) What are administrative and faculty attitudes toward accreditation of separate programs of study?

4) Does accreditation of separate programs by a professional agency assist or deter program development?

5) Does accreditation by a specialized agency require conformance to conditions or standards that tend to put the institution at odds with its own goals or objectives?

6) What is the effect of specialized accreditation on the general education content of vocational-technical curricula?

Since the study was concerned with eliciting attitudes and feelings to be used as focal points for future investigations, minimal statistical analyses were attempted. The items on the questionnaire were grouped and analyzed according to the respondents' institutional responsibility, type of accreditation found in the institution, and number of programs within the institution leading directly to employment. It was felt that categorical differentiations would both elucidate differences and similarities and be useful in a subsequent, more definitive research effort.

Following is a report of some of the most relevant data elicited by the questionnaire:

Some Institutional Views on Regional Accreditation

> In your judgment is the regional accrediting association appropriately organized and staffed to evaluate vocational-technical programs as part of the total institutional evaluation?

The overall response was not positive (Table 3), with an affirmative high of 41 percent from institutions with regional accreditation (Group I) to a negative low of 61 percent from the technical and special purpose institutions (Group III). Analyzed by level of institutional responsibility, the total "yes" response from some 310 respondents of 43 two-year colleges was 38 percent. Of these, the 25 responding presidents were the most favorably disposed, with 56 percent of them indicating approval of regional association staffing. Least positive were the 52 faculty members, whose "yes" and "no" responses were equal (31 percent), but whose appreciable proportion of "don't know" answers suggested a more limited level of information and involvement.

Respondents from institutions with the least number of programs leading directly to employment (0-10) were less positive (29 percent) that regional associations were adequately staffed; institutions with 11-25 programs and 26 or more programs were more positive (40 percent).

> In your experience are the criteria utilized by the regional accrediting associations in evaluating vocational-technical programs appropriate?

In this instance, the most positive response (42 percent) was expressed by institutions with both regional and specialized accreditation

(Group II). As might be expected, Group III institutions were quite negative, with 57 percent indicating "no," and only 14 percent indicating "yes." Less than half (48 percent) of the presidents indicated satisfaction, and division chairmen were even more negative, with only 38 out of 131 (29 percent) in agreement with the criteria being used. When tabulated by the number of occupational programs, the finding again was that the degree of approval expressed varied directly with the number of such programs in an institution (Table 4).

Although the questionnaire returns indicated a feeling that the regional association needed to improve both staffing and criteria, answers to a later question suggested optimism that this could be done. When asked if accreditation of separate vocational-technical curricula could be accomplished through the regional association, both groups of comprehensive community colleges (65 percent and 64 percent respectively) were responsive to the possibility (Table 5). The special purpose institutions (39 percent "yes" and 46 percent "no") seemed less hopeful.

The presidents were most sure (76 percent) that program accreditation could be handled by the regional association, with deans and division chairmen next, but only half of the faculty respondents agreed.

> It has been suggested that institutions not now eligible for accreditation, such as area vocational schools and technical institutes, be accredited by regional accrediting associations. Do you agree, disagree, have no opinion?

The response to this query was generally favorable (Table 6). Group III, the single-purpose institutions, which have the most to gain from the opportunities presented by such an expansion, were indeed the most receptive of the three groups, with 57 percent indicating agreement.

Group II institutions, with a 50 percent positive response, had only 12 percent who disagreed, and 36 percent with no opinion. Of the 43 participating institutions, only 17 percent disagreed and 27 percent had no opinion.

Responses analyzed by level of responsibility indicated that 68 percent of the presidents, as against 42 percent of division chairmen, were agreeable to such a move, whereas 34 percent of the latter had no opinion and 21 percent disagreed.

Although the American Vocational Association is on record as being strongly in favor of access to the regional associations for its members, those of its members who participated in this study were somewhat less favorably disposed.

It is part of the total picture that one of the major subjects discussed at the 1967 annual meeting of the National Commission on Accrediting was the expansion of the function of the regional association to include institutions which do not emphasize general education, such as technical and proprietary schools. The NCA's recommendation that the Federation of Regional Accrediting Associations consider the inclusion of all post high school institutions in their operational scheme was accepted in principle, but no action was taken.

Attitudes Toward Accreditation of Separate Programs

As stated earlier, the American Association of Junior Colleges has formally taken the position that institutional accreditation by a regional accrediting association is adequate for assuring the quality of vocational programs. At least one state, Florida, has supported the AAJC view, and has recommended, through its State Department of Education Bureau of Junior Colleges, that its colleges not seek accreditation by any group other than the regional association. Of late, the Associate Commissioner of Education has twice proposed a softening of this position, but college presidents generally have not been responsive. While some colleges in Florida continue their association with various specialized agencies, there is less of this kind of accrediting activity there than in other states with highly developed junior college systems.

The following series of related questions were asked to determine to what extent the AAJC position is reflected in the various institutions. It should be emphasized that the data must be viewed as information from a group of highly informed respondents with special responsibility for vocational-technical education.

> Should separate vocational-technical curricula be accredited?

Fifty percent of the respondents said "yes" and only 32 percent said "no" (Table 7). As expected, 88 percent of Group III institutions, staffed primarily to meet a special need, were in favor. Group I institutions were almost evenly divided, with 40 percent indicating "yes" and 39 percent indicating "no."

When the responses to the same question were summarized according to the job responsibility of the respondent, the institutional positions became clearer. Sixty percent of the presidents were against separate program accreditation, and 28 percent approved. The response of division chairmen, however, was almost in direct contrast: 62 percent approved and 23 percent disapproved.

Assessments of the appropriateness of program accreditation evidently reflect the thinking of a body of peers rather than that of the total institution. Many of those against separate accreditation shared the feeling that, as one person put it, "vocational-technical education is part of the total institution and should be so treated. To accredit specific programs would further separate vocational departments." Others who reacted negatively did so not on the basis of cost or loss of identity, but because they feared it would cause a splintering of institutional loyalty. Loyalty, however, was also expressed in another type of response, as for example: "I feel it would upgrade curricula in this area faster than is being done at present."

Institutions with only regional accreditation did not necessarily view it as the exclusive answer to accreditation needs. Forty percent of the Group I institutions felt that separate programs should be accredited, 39 percent opposed the idea, and 17 percent had no opinion. Approximately one-third of the presidents and two-thirds of the division chairmen supported the idea of program accreditation. It seems clear that the overall degree of interest evinced in specialized accrediting activity in the two-year college is greater than would be assumed from the position taken by the American Association of Junior Colleges.

> If some of the programs in your institution are accredited by specialized agencies, what do you feel are the most important reasons for having accreditation?

The largest group of respondents from these institutions indicated that prestige was the primary benefit of accreditation, an important factor both in placing graduates and in aiding in transfer to other institutions. One vocational-technical instructor stated, "It seems almost a requirement for transfer purposes. Regionals are not equipped themselves to carry on reasonable evaluations and are, therefore, influenced by membership or lack of membership in specialized accrediting associations." A large number of respondents indicated that eligibility for funding was the primary reason for their involvement which, of course, was a reflection of the Nurse Training Act legislation in effect at the time. One dean, however, responded, "I can't think of a single reason for it!"

> In your judgment, what are the important reasons why an institution should not seek specialized accreditation?

The responses to this open-ended question again fell into a pattern. The largest group of respondents indicated cost as a primary factor, with differing standards within the professions as the second most cited reason. There was a general feeling expressed that specialized accreditation placed the institution at odds with itself. One president pointed out, "Specialized accreditation tends to set up special categories and divisions working counter to general institutional policy." Divisiveness was again a prominent feature in one program chairman's comment: "Vocational-technical education should be considered a part of the total college program and not subjected to special review." Another respondent expressed his discomfort with specialized accreditation by stating, "This tends to create islands in the curriculum with each area vying for special accreditation."

> To what extent is there interest within your institution in seeking accreditation by specialized agencies?

The positive response from the special purpose institutions, those with specialized accreditation only (Group III), was 98 percent (Table 8). Thirty-eight percent of the institutions with regional accreditation only (Group I) professed no interest, while 61 percent of these indicated either interest or neutrality. Forty-two percent of the institutions with both types of accreditation (Group II) expressed interest, with only 27 percent taking a neutral position.

Presidents and division chairmen were clearly more convinced than deans that there was interest in seeking accreditation (56, 57, and 40 percent respectively).

When coded according to the number of occupational programs in operation, the responses showed that about 60 percent of the institutions with between 0-10 vocational programs were interested, while only 27 percent of the institutions with 26 or more programs were interested.

> To what extent is there opposition within your institution to seeking accreditation by specialized agencies?

Group III institutions again indicated least opposition and Group I institutions, with 40 percent, the most (Table 9). Presidents sensed the most opposition (48 percent) and division chairmen the least (26 percent). In terms of program size, institutions with the largest number of programs were in most opposition, and those with the smallest number, the least. The total response to the question relating to opposition was evenly balanced, with approximately one-third of the respondents falling into each of the three categories of answers.

Responses to the questionnaire indicated support for the regional association, but with an expanded role. This support of the regional association, coupled with the interest shown in program accreditation, sharpens the relevance of the National Commission's proposal for joint accrediting visits. Perhaps both presidents and division chairmen could be satisfied through the expedient of giving the regional association more responsibility for accrediting specific programs.

> Does the specialized accrediting agency act as a deterrent to program development in vocational-technical education in your institution?

Since the specialized agencies hold that they assist institutions in the important task of developing and implementing new programs, the questionnaire attempted to assess how successfully they performed this function in the eyes of the institutions. Fifty-nine percent of the total response group indicated it is not a deterrent to program development, while 12 percent indicated that it is (Table 10). Of the three groups, Group III institutions were most definite that the agency is not a deterrent (84 percent). Institutions with the largest number of vocational programs felt the inhibiting effect of the agency more than the smaller institutions (19 percent vs. 7 percent). Again, institutions with fewer programs were more oriented to the prestige and benefits that accrue to accredited status. It may be that as institutions implement more and more programs, they receive their rewards from this accomplishment rather than from accreditation by specialized agencies.

> Is the specialized accrediting agency a positive factor in developing vocational-technical education in your institution?

Group I and II institutions (19 and 24 percent respectively said "yes") differed sharply from Group III institutions (70 percent) on this critical point of whether agency activity constitutes a positive

d

force in developing curricula (Table 11). In addition, a marked proportion (46 percent) of institutions with both kinds of accreditation (Group II) felt that the agency was not a positive factor.

Division chairmen were most convinced of the value of the agency in this area (40 percent); only 24 percent of the deans and directors and 24 percent of the presidents (6 of the 25) agreed. Faculty members expressed both the ambivalence about the value of the agency in this respect (35 percent gave "don't know" responses), and least approval (40 percent). Institutions with large numbers of programs again were less favorably impressed (19 percent) than were those with fewer programs (34 percent).

From the data, the conclusion must be drawn that the role of the specialized agency in the area of program development was perceived as neutral--neither particularly valuable nor a deterrent. Although the various agencies have, over the years, claimed that services to new and developing programs constitute a major effort of their organizations, appreciable percentages of the respondents from the institutions studied evidently were not persuaded.

> Have there been instances of policy modification to accommodate vocational-technical curricula on your campus in the area of student selection, student retention, employment of professional personnel, educational requirement necessary for graduation?

There are two different and prevailing beliefs about specialized accreditation: 1) that institutions modify their policies and/or programs to accommodate to the accreditation agency, and 2) that procedure is modified to accommodate various vocational programs without regard to the agency involved.

To document institutional practice in this regard, conduct with respect to student selection and retention, requirements for graduation, and employment of professional personnel was assessed.

Only to the query about modifications with respect to student retention did a marked number of respondents answer "no" (59 percent as opposed to 20 percent "yes"), which suggests that it was primarily in the area of grading that there was a major effort to adhere to institutional policy (Table 12). When tabulated by level of responsibility, the respondents were remarkably consistent in this area, with presidents the most definite that there had been no deviation from stated policy relating to grading.

About educational requirements for graduation, however, the response was more mixed. The total "no" response was 51 percent, but the "yes" response, indicating some deviation from published policy, was 34 percent (Table 13). While 40 percent of the presidents and deans indicated that there had been modification of graduation policy on their campus, only 21 percent of the faculty respondents agreed. Approximately 40 percent of the respondents with major responsibility for defining policy felt that the policy relating to graduation had been subject to some modification to accommodate occupational programs, but only 21 percent of the faculty members who ventured an opinion felt that this was the case. This response could indicate several things, but is probably most reflective of faculty members' feelings that standards are their province and therefore less subject to manipulation.

Fifty-seven percent of the institutions with few programs (0-10) indicated they felt there had been no deviation from policy, while 29 percent felt there had been. In contrast, those institutional respondents from the institutions with larger numbers of programs (26+) indicated some deviation in almost half of the responses (42 percent "yes" and 45 percent "no"). Again, flexibility and the willingness to "accommodate" varied directly with the number of vocational programs in operation. Institutions with many programs gave the impression of being more willing than those with fewer programs to adjust standards and criteria when necessary for the functioning of programs.

With respect to the practice of deviating from stated admissions criteria so as to admit students to special programs, approximately 45 percent of the respondents from the comprehensive community colleges (Groups I and II) indicated they knew of instances when policy had been modified (Table 14). The great similarity of responses from these two groups highlights the contrast between their attitudes and those of Group III institutions: Seventy-one percent of respondents from the specialized institutions felt their standards were not abrogated in the interests of acceding to agency criteria.

The responding presidents in the sample were evenly divided on the question, with 12 indicating "yes" and 12 "no," whereas faculty awareness of modification of policy relating to admission was indicated in 35 percent of responses.

In general, the responses suggested that standards for admission are evidently modified in many instances, although by no means universally. The special interest institutions reported least deviation from stated policy, indicating either more realistic admissions standards or less willingness to relax requirements. Both groups of comprehensive community colleges, however, indicated a good deal of deviation from stated policy. The obvious need to stray from formal standards strongly suggests that the requirements for admission to programs with specialized accreditation need review.

> Have there been instances of policy modification to accommodate vocational-technical curricula on your campus in the area of employment of professional personnel?

Forty-three percent of respondents from Group I institutions, 50 percent from Group II, and 42 percent from Group III felt that institutional policy had been modified in employing faculty in the vocational-technical area (Table 15). Fifty-one percent of Group III respondents, however, reported no awareness of instances of deviation.

Presidents and deans were more convinced that there had been deviation from written institutional policy relating to employment of faculty (52 percent) than were division chairmen and faculty members (46 percent and 29 percent respectively). Perhaps once again the differences were related to level of responsibility, since the greater percentages of respondents aware of adjustments were those in a position to observe from a wide, overall institutional base, rather than from a narrower teaching one.

Although a majority of the respondents who took a position on the question felt that some modification of institutional policy had been made to secure faculty for vocational-technical programs, the response did not support the view that deviations were related to accreditation. Institutions with one or more programs accredited by a specialized agency were no more prone to tolerate deviations than were institutions with only regional accreditation.

Movement away from institutional policy did not seem related to accrediting style, but rather to a desire to shape or implement programs. Comments solicited indicated that the need to initiate and carry through a program was considered more important than institutional regulations. In general, the comprehensive institution, especially the one with many programs in operation, was more concerned with implementing programs than policies, while the special interest institution was more concerned with implementing regulations that had been devised to accommodate specific programs.

General Education and the Specialized Agency

Earlier studies on accreditation have shown that the general education content of the various curricula are affected by the type of accreditation involved. Booker (1954), for example, found less general education or common learnings content in courses with specialized accreditation than in similar curricula accredited by the regional association. However, general education takes on added importance in a swiftly changing society, for as new technology emerges and the rate of retraining for meaningful employment increases, flexibility, information, and understanding of the rationale for change become increasingly valuable.

The focus of the following series of questions was on the level and amount of general education found in vocational-technical programs and on the relationship between this requirement and the kind of accreditation used by an institution.

Is work in general education a requirement in each vocational-technical curriculum on your campus?

Seventy-four percent of the respondents stated that courses in general education are required, 8 percent said they are not, and 15 percent (the greatest proportion of these from special purpose institutions) indicated that they are required only for programs leading to a degree (Table 16).

The reports again varied somewhat according to level of responsibility, although in this instance the presidents constituted the smallest proportion of those who claimed to require general education courses (68 percent).

The number of vocational programs in an institution seemed to be related to the existence of a general education requirement. A greater proportion of institutions with more than 26 vocational programs had such a requirement than did institutions with no more than 10 programs (89 percent vs. 69 percent).

Asked in a corollary question to assess the general education requirement in the various vocational-technical programs and to compare it with the requirements for other programs in the college, only 34 percent of the total group indicated that the general education requirement was the same as in other areas of the college program, and 49 percent thought that there was less of a credit requirement than in other curricular offerings (Table 17).

The requirement did not vary by whether accreditation was by regional association or specialized agency, with the exception that responses from Group III institutions indicated more of a general education requirement for vocational programs than for others (11 percent). Since a similar claim was made by only 2 percent of the Group I and 4 percent of the Group II institutions, it seemed apparent that one way special purpose institutions gave relatively greater weight to their technical training programs was through a strong general education requirement.

The presidents who responded to the questionnaire felt that the requirement in general education was less (68 percent), but only 40 percent of the responding faculty felt this was the case. The presidents were the only group that did not claim to require more general education for at least some vocational education students than for other enrollees.

> Has it been your experience that accreditation by a specialized accrediting agency increases, decreases, or has no effect on the amount of general education course work in the curriculum?

Eighteen percent of the respondents believed that accreditation increased emphasis on general education, 18 percent felt that accreditation decreased it, 41 percent did not know what effect it had, and 20 percent indicated it had no effect. The differences between the three groups of institutions, including Group III, were minor.

Eight of the 25 presidents were convinced that accreditation tended to decrease the amount of general education given, 6 thought it had no effect, and 7 did not know (Table 18). The largest proportions of the 131 division chairmen, 102 deans, and 52 faculty also didn't know, although 26 percent of the chairmen felt the effect of accreditation was to increase the amount of general education given.

The evidence leads to the conclusion that most colleges have a general education requirement for their vocational-technical programs, and that the accrediting agency had not been a negative factor in the implementation of general education courses. The data make it clear that most institutions acknowledge the value of general education requirements regardless of the accrediting agency involved, and recent statements made by the various professional agencies are in line with the increasing awareness of the need for general education which is generally supported by this investigation.

> Do you see increasing pressure for specialized accreditation in the area of vocational-technical education?

Although for the most part the various associations supporting accrediting agencies were not found to be increasing their activity in the two-year colleges, the colleges involved in the survey felt that there was increased pressure for specialized accreditation. Of the total group of respondents, 52 percent felt pressure was increasing, as against 26 percent that felt no increase (Table 19). Group I institutions felt least increase in pressure (44 percent) while Group III institutions felt most (79 percent). Over two-thirds of the presidents felt increased pressure to accredit, compared with a little less than half of the division chairmen.

As a complement to the question about increased pressure, a question was asked about the origins of the pressure. Of the total group responding, 47 percent did not feel that the question was applicable, 29 percent felt the pressure came from outside, and two percent felt it came from within. Twenty-one percent indicated that they felt the pressure came from both sources (Table 20).

Sixty percent of the presidents indicated there was increased pressure for accreditation coming from outside the institution, but other members of the college staff did not feel so strongly, although there was a consistent feeling that pressure was not being generated solely from within the institution. The number of programs in operation did not seem to be a major factor in the perception of pressure reported, although institutions with the largest number of programs perceived the pressure as being generated from outside.

In light of the earlier concern within AAJC itself regarding the accrediting role of the National League for Nursing, perhaps the feeling expressed about pressure to accredit is not surprising. What is of interest, however, is the concensus that pressure was not intra-institutional. The explanation often advanced, that a group within the institution (deans, directors, or faculty) wants accreditation, seemed at best to be simplistic. As the institutions perceived it, forces external to the institution were the source of such pressure.

Undoubtedly, some of this reaction was a response to Federal legislation, but much of it seemed to be a pervasive, unfocused fear that could not be clearly related to the actual thinking expressed by the agencies which participated in this study.

Institutional Costs and Accrediting Activity

The relationship of the institution to the agency also has financial ramifications. One of the community college's major sources of anxiety stems from the anticipation that as the number of accrediting agencies increases, the costs of accrediting activity will continue to rise and eventually make it financially unfeasible for the institutions to remain involved.

In an attempt to assess the actual situation with respect to costs, only those real costs to the institutions in terms of outlay of money were examined. These were derived from the published materials prepared by the various associations actively accrediting at the community college level.

Institutional costs for accreditation can be placed into two broad categories: operating budget and staff time. Institutional expenses for application fees, dues, visitation fees, and consultant honoraria are easily ascertained, but it is most difficult to put a dollar value on staff time. There is no question, however, that a significant amount of time is committed to preparing the various questionnaires used by the agencies as back-up material for the site visit.

Considered one of the negative factors related to specialized accreditation, the concept of cost has been variously interpreted. Merson (1964) has stated that "the expenses and the work load imposed on an institution by multiple accreditation can severely tax its resources," and for some institutions, it is genuinely a hardship to meet any costs over and above those required to operate a basic program. It may be possible to create a situation which would enable community colleges to spend a significant portion of their operating budget on specialized accreditation, but such a situation does not now generally exist.

Review of the published materials of each of the 28 agencies established that there is a wide range of charges within each category examined--membership fees, dues, application and accreditation fees, and site visits. A significant number of agencies made no charge for services to the community college. For those that did, fees* ranged from a high of $1500 for initial accrediting and $575 for institutional annual dues. Annual dues also varied within agencies; one, for example, charged from $400 to $1400, depending on the size of the program being accredited.

When those five agencies which accredit programs in community colleges were considered, the same range was found (Appendix E). The National League for Nursing had the highest initial accrediting fee, as well as the highest annual dues. As of 1967, the Engineering Council for Professional Development had an initial accrediting fee of $400, and also levied annual dues. The National Association of Schools of Music had an initial membership fee for community colleges of $200 and a $50 annual dues cost, but both the AMA and ADA absorbed the accrediting costs within the parent organization and made no charge to the institution.

The cost to the community college of having a program accredited varied considerably. It was possible for a campus to support as many as seven accredited programs in the allied health fields at no cost to the institution for that accredited status. At the other end of the continuum, an accredited associate degree nursing program carried an accrediting cost of $1500, plus yearly dues which for 1966-67 was $575.

Obviously, professional associations vary greatly in their attitude toward costs for accreditation. Some feel the agency should participate in the financing of the accrediting process, others that the activity must be self-supporting. Summing up one of the views, Miller, of the Council on Dental Education, stated in 1965:

---

*The sum of all fees initially incurred by an institution in securing accredited status, and reported annually by the National Commission on Accrediting.

> In our view, a specialized accrediting agency charged with accreditation of programs within the purview of a profession should be obligated to discharge its responsibilities to the professions and to the educational institutions without requiring that fees or expenses of any type be borne by the educational institutions themselves.

Summary

The relationship of the specialized agency to the institution, and the way in which the institution perceives that relationship, is of pivotal importance. The agency sees itself as providing a valuable service to the institution and contributing to the health and welfare of the public. The institution, on the other hand, has been inclined to criticize the agency as being of marginal value and costly.

Responses to a questionnaire suggested that representative institutions in the sample felt that the regional associations are neither adequately nor properly staffed to evaluate the many programs leading to employment, and that their criteria for granting accredited status are not relevant. The general tone of responses indicated that separate program evaluation is legitimate and should continue, but that this accreditation should be done by the regional association, with its present procedures revised to accommodate specific program accreditation.

When queried about the role of the specialized agency in program development, the respondents proved to be neutral. They felt that the specialized agency neither assists in program development nor imposes criteria which retard such development. While some specialized agencies do provide assistance to institutions in initiating programs, institutional representatives felt that this is not a factor, either way, in the growth and development of programs. The data also indicate that accreditation by a specialized agency is not considered a major factor in the employability of graduates of vocational programs.

Recognizing the need for post high school vocational-technical education, community colleges offer many vocational programs and have attempted in many ways to meet individual and community needs. The questionnaire solicited information about the modification of institutional policy to accommodate the needs of programs leading to employment.

A majority of the institutions indicated that they deviated from stated policy both in employing staff and accepting students, and many institutions reported taking license with stated policy with respect to grading practices and requirements for graduation, but this finding was not related either to the type of accreditation used by an institution or the number of programs in operation.

The importance of general education was accepted by the institutions, and it was found that most vocational-technical programs have a general education requirement. While some differences existed between the groups of institutions distinguished by differing types of accreditation, the differences could not be positively related to the type of accreditation involved.

In general, the colleges evidently deviated from stated policy in a number of areas when it was necessary to make the various instructional programs operational. They also expressed a feeling of increasing pressure, largely from the outside, but partly from the faculty, for specialized accreditation.

The anticipated expense of accrediting activity has been a source of concern to the institutions, but a study of printed costs did not indicate that these apprehensions were well-founded. With one exception, the dollar costs were not high, and in most instances the service was provided without cost to the institution. While it was not possible to evaluate costs in terms of committee hours and allocation of personnel to do the necessary preparation, the conclusion must be drawn that cost in terms of outlay of money turned out not to be a valid concern.

Two-year college personnel appeared to be anxious about the activities of the specialized accrediting agency. The general position was one of appreciation for the value of separate program accreditation, coupled with a preference that this accrediting be done by a somewhat restructured regional association.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Definition and delineation of the relationship between the various segments of higher education and the community at large have long occupied the attention of educators. Over the decades, "autonomy" has developed into the reverent watchword which has keynoted all discussions of the issue.

Throughout the history of accrediting activity, critics have accused the accrediting agencies of "victimizing" the institution and eroding its autonomy. As community colleges became involved in accrediting activity, they became increasingly aware of these changes and uneasy about their implications for their own institutions.

In its broadest dimensions, this study sought to determine the limits of institutional tolerance for accommodating to the criteria of extra-institutional forces. Its most immediate focus, however, was on the relationship between the two-year college, as institution, and the specialized accrediting agency, as outside force.

In seeking to chart a course for its future, the two-year college has had to face many problems. One of the most serious has been that of gaining status and acceptance by the academic community, and in the course of its transition from public school image to that of a segment of higher education, the pre-baccalaureate institution has fallen heir to many of the problems that have beset higher education, including those related to accreditation.

Accepting the premise that voluntary accrediting is helpful, valid, and to be fostered, information was solicited which would not only lead to conclusions about the current situation, but to projections about the future, most centrally about the kind of relationship that could best accommodate the needs and wishes of the institution as well as the agency.

Seven issues which seemed to be of primary importance were studied. While much additional information was elicited which has proved invaluable, the following questions, expressing as they do the basic issues involved, provided both structure and focus:

> 1) To what extent are professional associations now approving curricula in community colleges? Has there been an effort on the part of these groups to accelerate their accrediting activity?

The data showed that, compared with the findings of earlier studies, specialized accreditation in the two-year colleges had declined, whereas accreditation by the regional associations was increasingly being sought. When the professional agencies were polled in an effort to assess their attitudes toward the two-year college, it was found that although the number of agencies had increased from 23 to 28 in the five year period from 1962-1967, there had been no increase in the number of agencies accrediting in the two-year college.

After passage of the Nurse Training Act in 1964, the number of community colleges seeking a pre-accredited status in NLN showed a sharp increase. It was the concensus, however, that few of these would apply for full accreditation. This trend was also confirmed by representatives of various professional agencies, some of which, such as dentistry, showed a continuing growth in membership among two-year colleges, while others showed an actual numerical decrease.

Only five of the specialized agencies participating in the study indicated that they were interested in accrediting programs in the two-year college, an additional four agencies reported having discussed the problem and decided against it, and none was willing to accredit programs that took less than two years to complete.

> 2) Is there any evidence which indicates that specialized accreditation either inhibits or promotes the development of occupational programs?

A basic function of most professional accrediting agencies is assistance to new and developing programs. With this as a defined role, it was assumed that the agency would be a positive factor in program development, but this was not found to be the case. The institutions did not feel that either accreditation per se or the accrediting agency was of much value to new programs. There was little difference found in rate or style of program development between institutions with specialized accreditation and those with regional accreditation. If the agencies want to continue to see their role in program development as important, they evidently should re-evaluate the assistance they are offering.

There was some feeling, reflected in other areas as well, that after a program is accredited the institution can attract somewhat better students. There was also general agreement, however, that accredited status is of little value in placing graduates.

③

3) Is there observable change in institutional autonomy as measured by modification of objectives or stated goals when specialized accrediting agencies are allowed to prescribe conditions or curricular patterns regarding program direction and/or staff utilization?

The issue was colored in part by the history of pressures on vocational-technical education from external sources. Institutions had so long been conditioned to Federal regulations and other extra-institutional pressures that it was difficult to assess the role of the accrediting agency in this area. The agencies were in general agreement that their role is to work with the institution in developing quality programs within the institutional framework, and without doing violence to the institution's independence or autonomy.

Although most of the agencies currently accrediting do specify certain curricular patterns to accredited institutions, the point at which such specifications become incongruent with institutional goals is difficult to determine. Analyses of curricula showed a marked similarity between programs with specialized accreditation and those without it.

Several of the accrediting agencies also specify staffing patterns, but few institutions perceived this as erosion of autonomy, since certification of vocational-technical instructors has been mandated by several states for many years.

The indications are that institutions can be forced to compromise their integrity more in response to Federal legislation than to accreditation.

4) Do specialized agencies request conformance to conditions or standards which tend to place the institution at odds with its own goals in such areas as student admission, performance of enrollees or employment of staff? 2

No relationship was shown between type of accreditation and the degree of willingness to modify policy, with the exception that institutions with only specialized accreditation reported somewhat less deviation from grading standards. The institutions surveyed indicated that, regardless of accreditation, they departed from policy both in making admissions to various occupational programs and in modifying requirements.

With respect to employment practices, a great majority of the institutions indicated that they did deviate from institutional policy in employing staff for occupational programs. This was done in the comprehensive junior colleges as well as the specialized institutions, with no apparent relationship to the type of accreditation involved.

The conclusion must be drawn that when institutions came in conflict with their own goals in the areas of standards for employment, grading, and graduation, it was as a consequence of many conditions, specialized accreditation being only one among them.

5) To what extent are the regional accrediting agencies assessing vocational-technical programs in their evaluation of the total institution? 2

Regional associations see their role as evaluating the total institution, under the general philosophy that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. Having established and perpetuated this philosophy, the regional association has been of little assistance to the institution in evaluating specific programs.

Queried on this issue, a majority of respondents from the institutions felt that specific program accreditation is valuable and that evaluations of programs and ideas made by peers from other institutions is beneficial, but there was no strong feeling that this should be handled by the specialized agency. The consensus of the institutions was that they would prefer to have the regional association assume that function. There was general agreement that institutional needs would be met if the regional associations would revise their criteria for evaluation and add team members with expertise in the vocational area.

> 6) If conflict exists among various forces within higher education in regard to the issue of specialized accreditation, what is the direction and magnitide of this conflict?

There is no question that there is misunderstanding and mistrust in the realm of specialized accreditation, and that they spring from the feeling that an external force is seeking to intrude into the institutional fabric. However, although responses to the questionnaire revealed a pervasive anxiety about "pressure" for program accreditation, institutional representatives were unable to specify a source of pressure, and there was no consensus on whether it came from students, faculty, industry, or national organizations. There was general agreement that the U.S. Office of Education, which has the prerogative to do so, is not eager to enter the accrediting picture because Federal legislation has historically supported the idea of institutional autonomy.

There is little doubt that the specialized agency serves a valuable purpose. While it was not the intent of this investigation to compare the two accrediting schemes, the indications were strong that each reinforces the other. Regional accreditation, with its concern for the internal cohesiveness of the total institution, is complemented by program accreditation, a wholly extra-institutional concern for the quality of individual programs.

Assuming that both systems are valuable, the task is to devise a methodology which allows each to facilitate the other. Perhaps one hope lies in the concept of cooperative activity, which would give institutions the opportunity to derive the benefits of assistance and support from teams of professionals supplied by the specialized agencies, while maintaining a total institutional commitment under the supervision of peers representing the regional association. This in substance is the proposal that has been made by the National Commission on Accrediting. If the professional associations see the function of their accrediting agencies as one of service to the institution as well as to the profession, then the NCA proposal seems valid.

It is logical to expect that the number of site visits would be decreased through the expedient of increasing cooperative effort. Another benefit of the cooperative approach is the opportunity for service to the institution: If the mechanics of site visits and the orientation of study team members were reduced, perhaps the association would be able to devote more time and energy to assisting in program development, a task to which it has, in theory, committed itself.

In addition to concerns over possible loss of autonomy, two-year colleges have been consistently anxious about the costs of accrediting activity and the possibility of being forced to accommodate an unwieldly proliferation of agencies. It is predictable, from what is known about institutional growth, that as programs develop to produce skilled manpower for the developing technologies, new organizations will continue to form from which new accrediting agencies will continue to emerge.

Cost did not prove to be a major factor for the institution, however, with a single exception, and the threat of proliferation has not materialized. (It must be remembered that no attempt was made to evaluate indirect institutional costs.) Nevertheless, recognition that new groups will evolve, and that some of these will wish to accredit programs in the two-year college, is all the more reason to implement a well-designed scheme of accreditation, one which will satisfy the organization and also allow the institution to preserve as much autonomy as possible.

For an institution to accommodate an external force without violating existing procedures and policies or inhibiting the establishment of new ones is a difficult but important task. In attempting to accomplish this in the area of accrediting, the two-year college has met with only partial success. The AAJC's request, on record since 1961, that member institutions not seek accreditation by specialized agencies, has met with only limited cooperation. Some of the problem may be related to the junior college's still ongoing attempt to institutionalize itself, for in the final analysis, institutionalization is the greatest safeguard of autonomy.

Some Implications

This report has attempted to evaluate some of the issues which have long been raised with respect to the activity of specialized accrediting agencies in the two-year college. Conceived as an exploratory effort, with a goal of assigning some priority to future investigations, the undertaking has determined the important dimensions of the problem.

It was found that the specialized agency is a general source of anxiety to the two-year college because the agency can ask for compliance to conditions which the institution fears are inappropriate. But study of the more specific areas of possible conflict, such as agency proliferation and cost to the institution, revealed that these are not currently critical problems.

Primarily because of its methods of funding, and its special needs for community acceptance and student support, vocational-technical education is vulnerable to outside pressure, such as would be exerted by an accrediting agency. It is therefore imperative that occupational education be institutionalized so that it can respond in its own best interest to the variety of pressures which will present themselves.

This exploratory effort suggests that the problems faced by the institution with regard to specialized accreditation are sociological in nature. The ambivalence noted in questionnaire responses relating to the focus of pressure for and against accreditation support this conclusion. Institutional representatives were convinced there was pressure, but were unable either to define its focus or identify individuals responsible for it. The same respondents also did not go beyond merely giving their opinion about whether accreditation was either good or bad; they did not attempt any delineation of its advantages and disadvantages.

In addition to the problem of licensure, the whole concept of intrusion from legislation is of utmost importance. There is evidence which indicates that some of the continuing problems in accreditation are the result of Federal legislation. This is a real issue for the institution, because the activities of professional lobbies could so structure higher education as to render it a restrictive and stagnant market place dealing only in programs which meet the needs of special interest groups. A major research effort is needed to explore the implications of restrictive legislation and its impact on institutional autonomy.

The history of voluntary accreditation is clouded with misunderstanding, and it is mandatory that this atmosphere be cleared. The data gathered in this investigation indicate that procedures are available which may go a long way toward solution of the current problem. Concentrated cooperative effort by the agencies and the institutions is necessary if they are to evolve mutually acceptable procedures.

Final Considerations and Further Questions

Accreditation of postsecondary institutions in this country has evolved out of a response to needs, all related to the element of protection, as perceived by three separate groups:

1. Colleges and universities feel the need to protect their collective welfare and the public from those among them who would operate on lower than minimum standards as set by the group. Known as voluntary accreditation, this form of interinstitutional cooperation was developed as an alternative to governmental assessment. It is now the dominant pattern, operating through six regional associations and a variety of professional agencies. Despite its imperfections, voluntary accreditation in its present form is an outstanding example of the willingness and ability of institutions and professions to police themselves and to implement standards. Even critics of the process are aware that it has met an important social need.

2. Organized professional work groups feel the need to protect their established admissions and training standards from the pressures of a variety of sources. This kind of concern is obviously reflected in the use of specialized professional agencies to accredit individual programs. Also voluntary in nature, it may or may not mesh easily with the regional association patterns of accreditation of _total_ institutions.

3. The public at large feels the need to protect the investment of public funds appropriated for educational purposes, and

customarily does this through legislative action. This amounts, in practice, to mandatory accreditation, even when a form of voluntary accreditation is used by colleges and universities to qualify themselves or their students for public money.

This simplified overview suggests both the complexity of the accrediting process and of the national accrediting situation. Given this complexity and the special response of cooperation and consternation accreditation arouses, a number of questions emerge which must be answered in an era of unprecedented expansion of education immediately beyond the high school:

1. What are the potential points of tension in the accrediting process, particularly at the postsecondary level of education?

The issues which have plagued higher institutions for many years and led to this study still exist. When both individual programs and whole institutions are accredited within a single institution, the institution feels itself in the untenable position of "being in the middle." Forced to deal with two kinds of associations and two sets of requirements, they must double up on accrediting efforts. The absence of a firmly structured form and procedure for accrediting also leaves the kind of hiatus that encourages governmental agencies to step in and specify an accreditation procedure to qualify institutions or programs for government funds, usually without regard for opinions from administrators or faculty about the accrediting form that most nearly satisfies their institutional purposes. These tension points are neither new nor static, and they tend to shift in form and degree. But their presence leads to an uneasy feeling in institutions that a conflict in goals and procedures may rear its ugly head at any time.

This report has indicated an apparent discrepancy between the expressed goals of the specialized agency and the values the institution attaches to specialized accreditation. The agency visualizes its role as protecting the health and welfare of the public, and in the service of achieving its primary goal, it moves to control entry into programs of study and the field of work. The institution, however, looks to the agency for help in improving programs, and perceives specialized accreditation as a device by which to increase institutional and faculty prestige, attract better students, and assist in securing funds. Although the specialized agency could be a positive force in behalf of the two-year college, the evidence indicates that it often neither satisfies institutional expectations nor achieves its own stated goals.

2. What is the existing state of tension among the parties involved in accrediting?

Initially, governmental stipulations for accreditation of nursing education had precipitated a great deal of anxiety about specialized agencies in two-year institutions. Subsequent modifications of the legislation greatly reduced the tensions, but the data revealed that some of the apprehensions never had been well-founded. Specialized agencies did not in fact proliferate at a great rate, accrediting costs to the institutions were not so great as to warrant undue concern, and although institutional representatives indicated some felt pressure, they were unable to define its source or identify individuals responsible for it.

There is also evidence that, even within the period of this study, much of the conflict in accrediting at the two-year college level had been resolved, just as it had in the past at the four-year college level. Some of the tension was reduced when, primarily through the mechanism of NCA, institutions and agencies learned to work together. And even more tension was reduced when the Commissioner of Education liberalized the requirements of the Nurse Training Act. The controversy with respect to nursing education is not entirely at an end, however, one current problem being that the Commissioner now includes state agencies among recognized accrediting bodies. While the National Commission on Accrediting recognizes that it is appropriate for state agencies to be listed, NCA is strongly advising its member institutions to seek state agency accreditation only if it is required by state law.

Stress was also alleviated when the Commissioner designated a special staff to deal with accreditation and institutional eligibility and appointed a national committee to advise on these matters.

Still another move forward has been the bringing together of various interest groups through the recent formation of the Interim Council on Accreditation for Occupational and Specialized Education.

At the outset, the primary concern of this Council is to develop appropriate accrediting procedures for vocational education in nonprofit and proprietary organizations, but it has the potential for exerting a long term influence on this type of education both in secondary schools and two-year colleges.

It appears at the moment, therefore, that many of the frustrations the institutions and agencies experienced only two years ago have been ameliorated, at least to the extent that the parties involved in the accrediting problem can now look at it objectively. It cannot be said, however, that accreditation as an issue has lost any of its significance during the time this study has been in progress. To the contrary, there is evidence that accrediting activity is increasing. New agencies are coming into being, new professions and semiprofessions are emerging, new Federal legislation for financial aid seems likely, and the discussions about the role of regional associations in relation to the professional groups continue.

As the associate director of NCA said in March, 1969, "The accreditation pot is boiling more vigorously today than it has at any time in the past." For this particular pot to continue to boil is a good thing, provided it does so in a climate which suggests, as the prevailing one does, that the problems that emerge will be viewed rationally and their solutions generally accepted.

3. Is it possible to discontinue mandatory accreditation for purposes of program approval?

The question about discontinuation of the Federal government's accreditation requirements as a condition for approval of Federally subsidized programs is often raised. Implied in the question is the idea that institutions could police themselves through existing voluntary machinery, and that the legislative requirement is but another aspect of Federal bureaucracy.

Despite the possible validity of this argument, two factors are likely to be strong deterrents to any such move. The first is the natural reluctance of the Congress to approve legislation for subsidizing educational programs and students without any factor of control. Such magical terms as "an accredited institution" or "an accredited program" become very real to a legislator when he considers a public investment for the common good. A second factor likely to preclude any move toward abolishing the accreditation requirement is concern about proprietary agencies and institutions. The fear is that without required controls they would be less likely than standard colleges and universities to protect the public by policing themselves and adopting rigorous standards and procedures.

Even if all involved were to agree that the accreditation requisite could be waived in certain areas of preparation, it is unlikely that the waiver would ever extend to the education of personnel for the health professions. In this instance, the urgency to protect the public is so great that Congress, the appropriate professional agencies, and the executive branch of both Federal and state governments would doubtless use all possible means to effect quality control.

In fact, William K. Selden, former Executive Director of NCA, has proposed the creation of an entirely new organization, governed by a board of representatives from each of the recognized health professions and the general public, to conduct the accreditation of educational programs in the health professions.

Largely for these reasons, and perhaps for others, the accreditation requirement will undoubtedly continue. This means that despite the recent gains in reconciling points of view and establishing workable procedures, the process of effecting agreement on both the substance and procedures of accreditation must be continuous.

4. What further research on accreditation is needed?

While many of the working relationships and forms of operation will undoubtedly improve through the sheer process of communication and cooperation, there are certain difficult problems which clearly call for further research, experimentation, and demonstration. Among these are:

1. Licensure. While this study has only touched on licensing and its ramifications, the subject inevitably arises here because of its many links with specialized accreditation. One of its most troublesome links is that most state licensing boards only permit graduates from accredited institutions to take their professional examinations. This in effect requires that applicants for licensing must qualify by two means. Coupled with this problem is the one

presented by the fact that standards and practices are different in boards within a state and also in comparable boards in the various states.

Another factor which figures largely in any discussion of licensing is the political nature of state licensing boards. The control they exert over so many training programs raises inevitable questions about the degree to which they are politically controlled, or at least characterized by political motivations. Issues such as these strongly suggest the desirability of undertaking a nationwide study of the various professional licensing boards. Such an investigation would identify licensing practices and procedures, assess their implications for professional preparation, and ultimately draw inferences about the relationship between licensure and accreditation.

2. Approving New Forms and Sources of Occupational Training. Recent Federal legislation pertaining to vocational education, together with the current concern for making the more disadvantaged members of society more employable through occupational training, raise an increasingly significant question: How can a greatly expanded program of occupational education be safeguarded?

Some steps in this direction have been taken. The new Interim Council on Occupational Education will undoubtedly concern itself with procedures for recognizing accrediting agencies in occupational education. Much of this education will be organized in various types of institutions and agencies, and formulated for high school graduates or older youth who dropped out of high school. While this spectrum of vocational education is not new, it is so greatly expanded and increasingly visible that the new Council was created at the request of representatives from no less than 18 organizations.

The American Vocational Association also has recently renewed its thrust to establish guidelines for criteria and standards for vocational education. Many of the institutions and industrial types of organizations which will offer programs in this area have not historically come under the purview of the regional associations, and the six regionals will undoubtedly be faced with new problems in meeting the needs of this field. Thus, both the substance and the form of this new and expanding problem are in a state of flux. Research and experimentation could make a significant contribution to the many agencies and individuals who are seeking workable solutions.

A major research thrust might involve, among other things, discovering the elements common to quality programs, both nonprofit and proprietary. Only when these elements are accepted and made an integral part of every program will voluntary accreditation have fulfilled its mission.

3. Problems of the Regional Associations. Because the regional associations play an increasingly vital role in voluntary accreditation, an overall study of these associations would be generally productive and would also bring to light ways in which a cooperative arrangement among them might be effected. The element of cooperation is especially critical because of the wide variations in the standards and criteria used for the evaluation of institutions below

the baccalaureate level. Most regional associations consider vocational education in two-year institutions as distinctly different from that in four-year colleges, and use different criteria for assessment and accreditation.

A study would also identify the problems which must inevitably arise as a consequence of the vast differences in the size of associations, and therefore in the number of states and institutions they potentially serve. Two of the regionals are spread over very large geographical areas and include states that themselves vary widely in size. Others serve regions so small that they seem provincial.

The findings of a comprehensive overview of the regional associations hopefully would point the way toward improving this form of voluntary accreditation on a national basis. If a model for cooperation between regionals were constructed, it would not only serve the best interests of the associations, but would also make an important contribution to the entire concept of voluntary accreditation.

Quite aside from the issues outlined above, various cooperative research projects are suggested by the unprecedented legal problems which the regional associations are now facing. For example, the case of the Marjorie Webster Junior College vs. the Middle States Association is one instance of the demands by proprietary institutions for inclusion in the accrediting process.

A Look Ahead

The 1960s have been significant as well as stormy years in postsecondary education in the United States. Rapid growth in numbers of institutions and enrollments, new programs, new attempts to revitalize curricula, increasing incidences of student and faculty activism, expanding involvement on the part of the Federal government, and mounting financial crises are but a few of the developments for which the decade will be remembered. And in a less conspicuous but nevertheless very real way the question of how best to determine institutional quality has constituted a pervasive thread which has run through the concerns of the period now about to end.

The decade of the 70s promises no major respite from expansion and problems. Almost inevitably the greatest thrust in higher education will be to accommodate an increasingly large and diverse clientele in various types of nonbaccalaureate institutions. As society faces new and changing manpower needs, the responsibility of postsecondary institutions to train for occupations will become more acute and complex.

Under all these circumstances, it takes little imagination to project the accrediting scene into the next several years. The social need to protect the innocent will continue, and voluntary groups and an array of professional agencies will increase their activities toward this end. Proliferation of institutions, both in numbers and in types, will contribute to the overall complexity, and despite the progress that has been made to date in reconciling the differences between all parties to accreditation, the problem of determining responsibility for excellence will remain. The tension between institutional independence and public accountability will undoubtedly be intensified and complicated by the inevitable conflict between the desire for autonomy and the increased pressure for coordinated effort. All concerned individuals will be called upon to exercise statesmanship. As T. R. McConnell (1966) has observed, the agency and the institution should "serve the broader public interest while preserving the identity, integrity, initiative and morale of individual institutions. . ."

Experience is a great teacher for those involved in working together, but since conditions, demands, and actions change constantly, the process of accommodation must be continuous. This is especially applicable to the whole process of accreditation, which must always maintain a delicate balance between the voluntary concept and the needs of society.

APPENDIX A

GROUP I INSTITUTIONS:

ARKANSAS
- Fort Smith Junior College

CALIFORNIA
- Alan Hancock College
- College of the Siskiyous
- Los Angeles Trade and Technical Institute
- Los Angeles Valley College
- Ventura College

FLORIDA
- Florida College
- Miami-Dade Junior College

ILLINOIS
- Mount Vernon Community College
- Chicago City Junior College (Wright Branch)

KENTUCKY
- Elizabethtown Community College

MASSACHUSETTS
- Massachusetts Bay Community College

MISSISSIPPI
- Hinds Junior College

NEW YORK
- State University of New York Agriculture and Technical Colleges
  - Farmingdale Branch

NORTH CAROLINA
- Brevard College

OREGON
- Treasure Valley Community College

PENNSYLVANIA
- Robert Morris Junior College

TEXAS
- Odessa College
- Tyler Junior College

WASHINGTON
- Grays Harbor College

GROUP II INSTITUTIONS

CALIFORNIA
- College of the Desert
- Cabrillo College
- Chaffey College
- Grossmont College
- College of Marin
- Sacramento City College
- Bakersfield Junior College

CONNECTICUT
- Junior College of Connecticut

FLORIDA
- Palm Beach Junior College

ILLINOIS
- Black Hawk College

INDIANA
- Vincennes University Junior College

KANSAS
- Hutchinson Community Junior College

MICHIGAN
- Delta College
- Muskegon Community College

MISSOURI
- Meramec Community College

NEW YORK
    Jamestown Community College
    Mohawk Valley Community College
    Queensborough Community College

WASHINGTON
    Highline College
    Yakima Valley College
    Wenatchee Valley College

GROUP III INSTITUTIONS

ILLINOIS
    DeVry Technical Institute

MASSACHUSETTS
    Wentworth Institute

NEW YORK
    Academy of Aeronautics

CONNECTICUT
    Norwalk State Technical Institute

OAKLAHOMA
    Oaklahoma State University Technical Institute

OREGON
    Oregon Technical Institute

MISSOURI
    General Technical Institute

IOWA
    Iowa State Technical Institute

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear

Enclosed are the questionnaires which you and members of your staff have graciously agreed to complete and return to us. We have included several copies of the questionnaire entitled "Accreditation Questionnaire." In addition to the general questionnaire, there is one copy entitled "Questionnaire B, Chief Administrative Officer." The second instrument includes the institutional material which would only be duplicated if answered by all members of your staff.

As you may recall from our earlier correspondence, we would ask that you distribute copies of the "Accreditation Questionnaire" to those most concerned with the problem. It would seem to us that this group would include instructional deans, vocational-technical deans and coordinators, as well as vocational-technical program chairmen or directors.

It is our hope that in addition to completing Questionnaire "B" you will also complete the primary questionnaire which is the source for the attitudinal information we are seeking.

May we take this opportunity to thank you for participating in this research effort; it is greatly appreciated by all concerned.

Sincerely yours,

L. E. Messersmith
Project Director

LEM/cc

ACCREDITATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Voluntary accreditation, non-governmental in nature, has over the years been accepted as most appropriate to the needs of education in the United States. This accreditation takes two basic forms: regional accreditation and professional or specialized accreditation. Regional accrediting associations are concerned with the quality of the total institution. Specialized accreditation is undertaken by professional associations to assure a level of proficiency for graduates of specific programs in specific areas. This questionnaire is concerned with both types of accreditation and their impact on vocational-technical programs in post-high school institutions. For the purposes of this investigation we have defined vocational-technical programs as those leading to immediate employment regardless of the transferability of the work taken.

1. What type of institution do you represent?

   1____community junior college
   2____technical institute
   3____area vocational school
   4____extension center

2. What is your present position within the institution?

   1____president
   2____dean
   3____director
   4____department or pgoram chairman
   5____faculty member
   6____other

   If you teach, please specify your subject area(s):

   ____

   ____

   ____

3. In your judgment is the regional accrediting association appropriately organized and staffed to evaluate vocational-technical programs as part of the total institutional evaluation?

   1____yes
   2____no
   3____don't know.

4. In your experience are the criteria utilized by the regional accrediting associations in evaluating vocational-technical programs appropriate?

   1____yes
   2____no
   3____no opinion

   If not, why not:____

   ____

   ____

5. Should the regional accrediting associations:
   a)____spend more time and effort in the area of vocational-technical education when evaluating an institution
   b)____cooperate with the specialized accrediting agencies in program evaluation
   c)____request that specialized accrediting agencies assume more responsibility for this segment of the curriculum
   d)____make no change in their evaluation procedures

6. Should separate vocational-technical curricula be accredited?

   1____yes
   2____no
   3____no opinion

   Why? ____

   ____

   ____

   How? ____

   ____

7. Do you think that accreditation of separate vocational-technical curricula COULD be accomplished through the regional associations?

1____yes
2____no
3____no opinion

Why? ______________________________

____

____

8. In your judgment, do specialized agencies allow for sufficient curricular innovation and experimentation in those programs which they accredit?

1____yes
2____no
3____don't know

9. If some of the programs in your institution are accredited by specialized agencies, what do you feel are the most important reasons for having accreditation?

____

____

____

10. In your judgment, what are the important reasons why an institution should not seek specialized accreditation?

____

____

____

11. Does there seem to be cooperation between the regional accrediting association and the specialized accrediting agencies in your region?

1____yes
2____no
3____don't know

Can you give examples? ______________________________

____

____

12. To what extent is there interest within your institution in seeking accreditation by specialized agencies?

1____a great deal of interest
2____some interest
3____a neutral attitude
4____little interest
5____no interest
6____don't know

13. How do you feel each of the following feels about specialized accreditation?

	Favors 1	Neutral 2	Opposes 3
The governing board:	____	____	____
Administration:	____	____	____
Faculty:	____	____	____
Employers:	____	____	____
Students:	____	____	____
Public:	____	____	____

Other: (Please specify) ______________________________

14. Does the interest in favor of specialized accreditation originate with:

	Yes 1	No 2
The governing board:	____	____
Administration:	____	____
Faculty:	____	____
Employers:	____	____
Students:	____	____
Public:	____	____

Other: (Please specify) ______________________________

15. To what extent is there opposition within your institution to seeking accreditation by specialized agencies?

1____a great deal of opposition
2____some opposition
3____a neutral attitude
4____little opposition
5____no opposition at all
6____don't know

16. Is work in general education a requirement in each vocational-technical curriculum on your campus?

1____yes
2____no
3____only those programs leading to a degree
4____don't know

In terms of credits, is the requirement:

1____the same as for student in transfer oriented programs
2____more than for students in transfer oriented programs
3____less than for students in transfer oriented programs
4____don't know

17. Has it been your experience that accreditation by a specialized accrediting agency:

1____increases the amount of general education course work in the curriculum
2____decreases the amount of general education course work in the curriculum
3____has no effect on the general education course work in the curriculum
4____don't know

18. Each institution establishes a rationale for conducting its own affairs. Have there been instances of policy modification to accommodate vocational-technical curricula on your campus in the area of:

(a) Student selection:

1____yes
2____no
3____don't know

If yes, in what way? ______________________________
____

(b) Student retention:

1____yes
2____no
3____don't know

If yes, in what way? ______________________________
____

(c) Employment of professional personnel:

1____yes
2____no
3____don't know

If yes, in what way? ______________________________
____

(d) Educational requirements necessary for graduation:

1____yes
2____no
3____don't know

If yes, in what way? ______________________________
____

19. The National Commission on Accrediting asks that specialized accrediting agencies meet various criteria prior to their being recognized. One criterion is the concept of social need. When a specialized agency claims a "social need" for accreditation, what meaning does this have for you?

____

____

____

20. Do you see increasing pressure for specialized accreditation in the area of vocational-technical education?

1____yes
2____no
3____don't know

21. If yes to above, does this pressure originate:

1____from within the institution
2____from outside the institution
3____from both areas
4____not applicable

What form does this pressure take? ____________________

____

22. In your field, how important is specialized accreditation in each of the following: (Administrators, please answer in terms of the total program)

	Very Important Factor	Somewhat Important Factor	Not Important Factor	Don't Know
"Selling" a vocational-technical program to students:	____	____	____	____
"Selling" a vocational-technical program to prospective employers:	____	____	____	____
Securing local or county financial support:	____	____	____	____
Securing state financial support	____	____	____	____

	Very Important Factor	Somewhat Important Factor	Not Important Factor	Don't Know
Securing federal financial support:	____	____	____	____
Securing financial support from industry or business	____	____	____	____

23. In addition to the interest of specialized accrediting agencies in high level, pre-professional and technical programs, is there a tendency for these groups to extend their interest to programs of training for the trades?

1____yes
2____no
3____no opinion

24. There is presently much discussion relative to external agencies and their relationship to higher education institutions. Does the specialized accrediting agency act as a deterrent to program development in vocational-technical education in your institution?

1____yes
2____no
3____don't know

If yes, in what way? ______________________________
____
____

25. Is the specialized accrediting agency a positive factor in developing vocational-technical curricula in your institution?

1____yes
2____no
3____don't know

If yes, in what way? ______________________________
____
____

26. In what ways other than through specialized accreditation can professional standards be maintained?

____
____
____

27. It has been suggested that institutions not now eligible for accreditation, such as area vocational schools and technical institutes, be accredited by regional accrediting associations. Do you:

1____agree
2____disagree
3____no opinion

Why? ____
____
____

28. It has been proposed on various occasions that one alternative to institutional accreditation by the regional association would be accreditation by the U. S. Office of Education. Would you find this alternative:

1____acceptable
2____not acceptable
3____no opinion

Why? ____
____
____

29. State licensure and specialized accreditation both have the same gross function, that of quantifying the capability of a person to perform a given task. Do you feel that licensure and specialized accreditation:

	Yes 1	No 2	No Opinion 3
a) accomplish different results but are complimentary:	___	___	___
b) accomplish the same end result:	___	___	___
c) necessitate extra effort on the part of the institution to prepare the student for two separate requirements	___	___	___

	Yes	No	No Opinion
d) work at cross purposes:	___	___	___
e) are independent of each other:	___	___	___

30. Assuming that an institution is accredited by a regional association, is there a need for additional validation of the quality of graduates from vocational-technical programs (e.g., by licensing, certification, etc.)

1____yes
2____no
3____don't know

Why? ______________________________
____
____

31. Assuming that an individual vocational-technical curriculum is accredited by a specialized accrediting agency, is there a need for additional validation of the quality of its graduates? (e.g., by regional accreditation, licensing, etc.)

1____yes
2____no
3____don't know

Why? ______________________________
____
____

32. Assuming that a state has a licensing board in a particular field such as dental hygiene, is there a need for additional verification of the quality of the graduates from that dental hygiene program? (e.g., regional accreditation, specialized accreditation, etc.)

1____yes
2____no
3____don't know

Why? ______________________________
____
____

33. Is there an effort in your state to increase the scope and power of state licensing boards?

1____yes
2____no
3____don't know

If yes, in what fields? ______________________________
____

By whom? ______________________________________
____

The following questions are for statistical analysis only.

34. Sex of respondent

1____female
2____male

35. Age of respondent

1____20-25
2____26-30
3____31-35
4____36-40
5____41-45
6____46 and over

36. Level of education

1____less than B.A.
2____B.A.
3____B.A. +
4____Master's
5____Master's +
6____Doctorate

Would you like to make any additional comments or suggestions at this point?

QUESTIONNAIRE
to
Chief Administrative Officers

1. What is the approximate total day enrollment of your institution?

1____401-800
2____801-1200
3____1201-1600
4____1601-2000
5____2001-2400
6____2401-2800
7____2801-3200
8____3201-3600
9____over 3600

2. What is the approximate total enrollment (day and evening) of the various vocational-technical programs within your institution?

01____0-25
02____26-50
03____51-75
04____~~76-100~~
05____101-200
06____201-300
07____301-400
08____401-500
09____501-1000
10____1001-1500
20____1501-2000
30____2001-3000
40____over 3000

3. How many distinct programs which can lead to immediate employment are to be found within your institution?

1____0-5
2____6-10
3____11-15
4____16-25
5____more than 25

4. Are there additional vocational-technical programs scheduled to begin in the near future?

1____yes
2____no
3____not applicable

If yes, please list: ________________________________
____
____

5. Is there a lay advisory committee which helps your institution plan its total vocational-technical program?

1_____yes
2_____no
3_____don't know/not applicable

6. Does your institution utilize an advisory committee for each vocational-technical curriculum or for each group of allied curricula on the campus?

1_____yes
2_____no
3_____don't know/not applicable

7. What is the relationship of your institution to the regional accrediting association?

1_____we are accredited by it
(date of accredication: ______________________)
2_____we intend to apply for accreditation
3_____we do not intend to apply for accreditation
4_____we have been denied accreditation
5_____we are not eligible for accreditation

____

8. At the present time, are there any vocational-technical curricula on your campus which require accreditation by a specialized agency in order to qualify for either state or federal assistance?

1_____yes
2_____no
3_____don't know/not applicable

If yes, please list:

__________________ __________________ __________________
__________________ __________________ __________________
__________________ __________________ __________________

9. Cost of accreditation varies greatly from institution to institution, but does, nevertheless, present a category of concern. Since cost is one of the issues in specialized accrediting activity, could you estimate the cost to your institution of specialized accreditation for:

a) The most expensive program is: ______________________

The costs are as follows:

	$0-200	$201-500	$500-1000	$1000 +
	1	2	3	4
preparation costs:	____	____	____	____
visitation, site visits costs:	____	____	____	____
yearly dues or fees:	____	____	____	____
total cost:	____	____	____	____

b) The least expensive program to accredit is: ____________

The costs are as follows:	1	2	3	4
preparation costs:	____	____	____	____
visitation, site visits costs:	____	____	____	____
yearly dues or fees	____	____	____	____
total cost:	____	____	____	____

10. Below is a list of some of the specialized accrediting agencies. Will you please:
    a) draw a line through those agencies for which you have no program, and,
    b) check the appropriate square for programs now in operation?

Check organization in which you hold membership		We are accredited by this agency	We intend to apply for accreditation from this agency	We are not interested in accreditation by this agency	We have been denied accreditation by this agency
___	1. National League for Nursing				
___	2. American Dental Association				
___	3. Board of Schools of Medical Tech				
___	4. Engineers' Council for Prof Devel				
___	5. Amer Assoc of Med Record Librarians				
___	6. American Optometric Association				
___	7. Amer Council on Pharmaceutical Educ				
___	8. American Physical Therapy Assoc				
___	9. American Occupational Therapy Assoc				
___	10. Natl Assoc of Schools of Music				
___	11. American Chemical Society				
___	12. Amer Assoc of Collegiate Sch of Bus				
___	13. Natl Architectural Accred Board				
___	14. Amer Council on Educ for Journalism				
___	15. Amer Soc for Landscape Architects				
___	16. American Library Association				
___	17. Society of American Foresters				
___	18. National Assoc of Schools of Art				

APPENDIX C

Questionnaire to Professional Associations

1. Does the organization you represent now accredit programs at the pre- or sub-baccalaureate level? Does it have an alternate plan of approval, acknowledgment or acceptance which is used in lieu of accreditation?

2. If your organization does not accredit or approve programs which are less than baccalaureate degree in nature at the present time, do you see this as a possibility within the next five years?

3. If the organization you represent now accredits programs at the pre- or sub-baccalaureate level, do you foresee any major change in emphasis or procedure in the near future?

4. Having had the opportunity to review the "staff position paper" prepared in January by the National Commission on Accrediting, could you comment on your general reaction to it? Has your organization taken a position in regard to this issue?

5. Do you feel the proposal calling for joint visits by the regional association and the professional accrediting group to junior colleges and technical institutes will prove adequate for your organization?

6. What is the position of your organization concerning the modification of the commission structure within NCA to include a wider range of attitudes as well as organizational representatives as suggested in the recently published Mayor report?

7. If your organization is one of those which has state licensure as an access road to the practice of the profession, how do you see this in relation to specialized accreditation?

8. In the professional group which you represent, would it be possible to substitute comprehensive national licensure laws for specialized accreditation?

9. There is a concern in some quarters that specific and meaningful criteria be utilized by the specialized accrediting agency to establish a definable level of "job entry skill." Is this a possibility within your organization? To what extent is this being done now?

10. What is the understanding within your organization of the concept of "social need?" How do your accrediting procedures reflect this concept?

11. There is a feeling on the part of some that an agency such as you represent creates an external force which deters the institution from its basic mission. If the institution has developed an "institutional self concept," how do you see the activities of your accrediting agency in relationship to this self concept?

APPENDIX D

Questionnaire to Regional Accrediting Associations

1. Have you been able to assess the attitude of junior colleges and other post-high school institutions in your region toward regional accreditation?

2. At its annual meeting of this year, the National Commission on Accrediting proposed a change in direction relating to accreditation of "post-high school institutions." This proposal was based on a staff position paper presented in January, 1967. What is your general reaction to both the document and the action of the Commission?

3. Part of the position paper referred to above relates to accreditation of proprietory and non-degree granting institutions. What is your reaction to this portion of the proposal?

4. There are many institutions which have accreditation from professional agencies, but which have not qualified for accreditation by the regional association. How is this problem being handled within your region? Have you established any procedures which relate to this problem?

5. Do you feel the concept of "joint visitation" is a workable solution to the accrediting dilemma faced by many institutions?

6. Do you feel the professional associations and the accrediting commissions will find the "joint visitation" concept sufficient for their needs? If not, what directions do you see developing?

7. What are the major problems that you foresee inexpanding the function of the regional association to accommodate the increased emphasis on less than baccalaureate level programs? Is this expansion possible, or is it even feasible?

8. Recent federal legislation makes accreditation even more important, if that is possible, than it has been in the past. Will this new look, and in some cases new direction, deter the regionals from their primary goal of assisting with institutional upgrading?

9. As regional accrediting moves into an era of expanded activity in cooperation with other organizations, what do you see as some of the major problems or points of issue?

10. How do you see accreditation activity in general relating to institutional integrity? Does accrediting (either regional or specialized) have an effect, positive or negative, on the ability of the institution to meet its commitments?

APPENDIX E

Accreditation Fees and Dues of Accrediting Associations which Accredit Programs in Community Colleges

Name of Association	Membership Fee	Initial Accreditation Fee	Re-Accreditation Fee	Annual Dues	Other Fees
American Dental Association	(Not based on Accredited Status)	None	None	None	None
American Medical Association	(Not based on Accredited Status)	None	None	None	None
Engineers' Council for Professional Development		$200 basic fee $200 each curricula	Same as Initial Accreditation	No Answer	None
National Association of Schools of Music	Association Member exam fee: $200 to $300	Full member $200 to $300 plus expenses	$200 to $300	$50 to $150	
National League for Nursing		Members $30 per visitor per day	None	$575	Appeal hearings $100 per day plus expenses

APPENDIX F

TABLE 1

Attitudes of Seventeen Agencies toward Accrediting Activity in the Community College

	Accredit	No plans	Do not accredit; have not discussed
1. National Architectural Accrediting Board		X	
2. American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business		X	
3. American Chemical Society		X	
4. American Dental Association	X		
5. Engineers' Council for Professional Development	X		
6. Society of American Foresters		X	
7. American Council on Education for Journalism			X
8. American Society of Landscape Architects			X
9. American Library Association			X
10. American Medical Association	X		
11. National Association of Schools of Music	X		
12. National League for Nursing	X		
13. American Optometric Association		X	
14. American Council on Pharmaceutical Education		X	
15. American Public Health Association		X	
16. Council on Social Work Education			X
17. National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education			X

TABLE 2

Programs Accredited by Member Agencies of the National Commission on Accrediting, 1969

Organization and Program	NCA Sanction	No NCA Sanction
Council on Medical Education		
X-ray Technology		X
Cytotechnology		X
Inhalation Therapy		X
Medical Technology		X
Engineers' Council for Professional Development	X	
Council on Dental Education		
Dental Hygiene	X	
Dental Assistance	X	
Dental Technology		X
National Association of Schools of Music (Degree programs only)	X	
National League for Nursing	X	

TABLE 3*

Assessments of the Competence of Regional Association Staffs to Evaluate Vocational-Technical Programs

Institutional Type		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Group I	N	58	33	44	4	139
	%	41	23	32	3	
Group II	N	46	40	30	2	118
	%	39	34	25	2	
Group III	N	13	34	9	0	56
	%	23	61	16	0	
Total	N	117	107	83	6	313
	%	37	34	26	2	100

Institutional Responsibility of Respondent		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Presidents	N	14	8	2	1	25
	%	56	32	8	4	
Deans and Directors	N	43	38	19	2	102
	%	42	37	19	2	
Division Chairmen	N	44	43	42	2	131
	%	34	33	32	2	
Faculty and Others	N	16	16	20	0	52
	%	31	31	38	0	
Total	N	117	105	83	5	310
	%	38	34	27	2	100

Number of Occupational Programs		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
0 - 10	N	35	51	33	3	122
	%	29	42	27	2	
11 - 25	N	49	34	31	2	116
	%	42	29	27	2	
26 +	N	25	18	18	1	62
	%	40	29	29	2	
Total	N	104	103	82	6	300
	%	36	34	27	2	100

*The total N's in the tables differ slightly because not all of the 314 respondents answered all the questions.

TABLE 4

Assessments of Criteria Used for Accreditation

Institutional Type		Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer	Total
Group I	N	54	33	48	4	139
	%	35	24	35	3	
Group II	N	49	29	37	3	118
	%	42	25	31	2	
Group III	N	8	32	15	1	56
	%	14	57	27	2	
Total	N	111	94	100	8	313
	%	36	30	32	2	100

Institutional Responsibility of Respondent		Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer	Total
Presidents	N	12	9	3	1	25
	%	48	36	12	4	
Deans and Directors	N	43	33	23	3	102
	%	42	32	23	3	
Division Chairmen	N	38	37	53	3	131
	%	29	28	40	2	
Faculty and Others	N	17	14	21	0	52
	%	33	27	40	0	
Total	N	110	93	100	7	310
	%	36	30	32	2	100

Number of Occupational Programs		Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer	Total
0 - 10	N	35	42	42	3	122
	%	29	34	34	2	
11 - 25	N	41	33	38	4	116
	%	35	28	33	3	
26 +	N	27	18	16	1	62
	%	44	29	26	2	
Total	N	112	94	100	8	314
	%	36	30	32	2	100

TABLE 5

Assessments of Feasibility of Program Accreditation by the Regional Accrediting Association

Institutional Type		Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer	Total
Group I	N	91	22	21	5	139
	%	65	16	15	4	
Group II	N	76	20	19	3	118
	%	64	17	16	3	
Group III	N	22	26	6	2	56
	%	39	46	11	4	
Total	N	189	68	46	10	313
	%	60	22	15	3	100

Institutional Responsibility of Respondent		Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer	Total
Presidents	N	19	3	1	2	25
	%	76	12	4	8	
Deans and Directors	N	71	17	11	3	102
	%	70	17	11	3	
Division Chairmen	N	73	38	18	2	131
	%	56	29	14	2	
Faculty and Others	N	26	9	16	1	52
	%	50	17	31	2	
Total	N	189	67	46	8	310
	%	61	22	15	3	100

Number of Occupational Programs		Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer	Total
0 - 10	N	71	24	22	5	122
	%	58	20	18	4	
11 - 25	N	72	27	17	0	116
	%	62	23	15	0	
26 +	N	38	14	6	4	62
	%	61	23	10	6	
Total	N	181	65	45	9	300
	%	60	22	15	3	100

TABLE 6

Attitudes Toward Expanding the Scope of the Regional Association

Institutional Type		Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	No Answer	Total
Group I	N	74	25	33	7	139
	%	53	18	24	5	
Group II	N	59	14	42	3	118
	%	50	12	36	3	
Group III	N	32	14	10	0	56
	%	57	25	18	0	
Total	N	165	53	85	10	313
	%	53	17	27	3	100

Institutional Responsibility of Respondent		Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	No Answer	Total
Presidents	N	17	3	3	2	25
	%	68	12	12	8	
Deans and Directors	N	64	15	22	1	102
	%	63	15	22	1	
Division Chairmen	N	55	27	45	4	131
	%	42	21	34	3	
Faculty and Others	N	27	8	15	2	52
	%	52	15	29	4	
Total	N	163	53	85	9	310
	%	53	17	27	3	100

Number of Occupational Programs		Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	No Answer	Total
0 - 10	N	56	28	35	3	122
	%	46	23	29	2	
11 - 25	N	70	13	29	3	115
	%	60	11	25	3	
26 +	N	30	11	18	3	62
	%	48	18	29	5	
Total	N	156	52	82	9	299
	%	52	17	27	3	100

TABLE 7

Attitudes Toward Accreditation of Separate Programs

Institutional Type		Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer	Total
Group I	N	56	54	24	5	139
	%	40	39	17	4	
Group II	N	52	45	15	6	118
	%	44	38	13	5	
Group III	N	49	1	4	2	56
	%	88	2	7	4	
Total	N	157	100	43	13	313
	%	50	32	14	4	100

Institutional Responsibility of Respondent		Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer	Total
Presidents	N	7	15	1	2	25
	%	28	60	4	8	
Deans and	N	42	44	10	6	102
Directors	%	41	43	10	6	
Division	N	81	30	17	3	131
Chairmen	%	62	23	13	2	
Faculty and	N	26	11	15	0	52
Others	%	50	21	29	0	
Total	N	156	100	43	11	310
	%	50	32	14	4	100

Number of Occupational Programs		Yes	No	No Opinion	No Answer	Total
0 - 10	N	67	36	14	5	122
	%	55	30	11	4	
11 - 25	N	59	36	17	4	116
	%	51	31	15	3	
26 +	N	23	24	12	3	62
	%	37	39	19	5	
Total	N	149	96	43	12	300
	%	50	32	14	4	100

TABLE 8

Interest in Accreditation of Separate Programs

Institutional Type		Interest	Neutral	No Interest	Total
Group I	N	45	36	50	131
	%	34	27	38	
Group II	N	49	31	36	116
	%	42	27	31	
Group III	N	55	0	1	56
	%	98	0	2	
Total	N	149	67	87	303
	%	49	22	29	100

Institutional Responsibility of Respondent		Interest	Neutral	No Interest	Total
Presidents	N	14	1	10	25
	%	56	4	40	
Deans and	N	39	22	37	98
Directors	%	40	22	38	
Division	N	72	32	23	127
Chairmen	%	57	25	18	
Faculty and	N	23	11	17	51
Others	%	45	22	33	
Total	N	148	66	87	301
	%	49	22	29	100

Number of Occupational Programs		Interest	Neutral	No Interest	Total
0 - 10	N	71	25	23	119
	%	60	21	19	
11 - 25	N	56	24	33	113
	%	50	21	29	
26 +	N	17	14	26	57
	%	30	25	46	
Total	N	144	63	82	289
	%	50	22	28	100

TABLE 9

Opposition to Accreditation of Separate Programs

Institutional Type		Opposition	Neutral	No Opposition	Total
Group I	N	55	47	29	131
	%	42	36	22	
Group II	N	44	44	26	114
	%	39	39	23	
Group III	N	3	3	49	55
	%	5	5	89	
Total	N	102	94	104	300
	%	34	31	35	100

Institutional Responsibility of Respondent		Opposition	Neutral	No Opposition	Total
Presidents	N	12	4	9	25
	%	48	16	36	
Deans and Directors	N	38	30	31	99
	%	38	30	31	
Division Chairmen	N	34	42	49	125
	%	27	34	39	
Faculty and Others	N	18	16	15	49
	%	37	33	31	
Total	N	102	92	104	298
	%	34	31	35	100

Number of Occupational Programs		Opposition	Neutral	No Opposition	Total
0 - 10	N	32	29	55	116
	%	28	25	47	
11 - 25	N	34	37	40	111
	%	30	33	36	
26 +	N	29	23	8	60
	%	48	38	13	
Total	N	95	89	103	287
	%	33	31	36	100

TABLE 10

Assessments of the Specialized Agency as a Deterrent to Program Development

Institutional Type		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Group I	N	15	75	43	6	139
	%	11	54	31	4	
Group II	N	15	63	37	3	118
	%	13	53	31	3	
Group III	N	6	47	3	0	56
	%	11	84	5	0	
Total	N	36	185	83	9	313
	%	12	59	26	3	100

Institutional Responsibility of Respondent		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Presidents	N	6	15	2	2	25
	%	24	60	8	8	
Deans and Directors	N	15	57	29	1	102
	%	15	56	28	1	
Division Chairmen	N	9	86	33	3	131
	%	7	66	25	2	
Faculty and Others	N	6	26	18	2	52
	%	12	50	35	4	
Total	N	36	184	82	8	310
	%	12	59	26	3	100

Number of Occupational Programs		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
0 - 10	N	9	80	29	4	122
	%	7	66	24	3	
11 - 25	N	12	68	32	3	115
	%	10	59	28	3	
26 +	N	12	32	17	1	62
	%	19	52	27	2	
Total	N	33	180	78	8	299
	%	11	60	26	3	100

TABLE 11

Assessments of the Specialized Agency as a Positive Factor in Program Development

Institutional Type		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Group I	N	27	57	48	7	139
	%	19	41	35	5	
Group II	N	28	54	33	3	118
	%	24	46	28	2	
Group III	N	39	15	2	0	56
	%	70	27	3	0	
Total	N	94	126	83	10	313
	%	30	40	27	3	100

Institutional Responsibility of Respondent		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Presidents	N	6	16	2	1	25
	%	24	64	8	4	
Deans and Directors	N	24	48	28	2	102
	%	24	47	27	2	
Division Chairmen	N	52	40	35	4	131
	%	40	31	27	3	
Faculty and Others	N	11	21	18	2	52
	%	21	40	35	4	
Total	N	93	125	83	9	310
	%	30	40	27	3	100

Number of Occupational Programs		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
0 - 10	N	42	49	28	3	122
	%	34	40	23	2	
11 - 25	N	39	42	31	3	115
	%	34	36	27	3	
26 +	N	12	30	17	3	62
	%	19	48	28	5	
Total	N	93	121	76	9	299
	%	31	40	25	3	100

TABLE 12

Reports of Deviations from Institutional Policy in Grading

Institutional Type		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Group I	N	35	70	25	9	139
	%	25	50	18	7	
Group II	N	21	74	20	3	118
	%	18	63	17	2	
Group III	N	8	42	4	2	56
	%	14	75	7	4	
Total	N	64	186	49	14	313
	%	20	59	16	5	100

Institutional Responsibility of Respondent		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Presidents	N	5	18	1	1	25
	%	20	72	4	4	
Deans and	N	23	63	13	3	102
Directors	%	23	62	13	3	
Division	N	26	73	27	5	131
Chairmen	%	20	56	20	4	
Faculty and	N	10	32	7	3	52
Others	%	19	62	13	6	
Total	N	64	186	48	12	310
	%	20	59	16	5	100

Number of Occupational Programs		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
0 - 10	N	13	84	19	6	122
	%	11	69	15	5	
11 - 25	N	31	64	14	6	115
	%	27	55	12	5	
26 +	N	18	28	14	2	62
	%	29	45	28	3	
Total	N	62	176	47	14	299
	%	20	59	16	5	100

TABLE 13

Reports of Deviations from Institutional Policy in Graduation Requirements

Institutional Type		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Group I	N	45	70	15	9	139
	%	32	50	11	7	
Group II	N	48	56	11	3	118
	%	41	47	9	3	
Group III	N	14	35	4	3	56
	%	25	63	7	5	
Total	N	107	161	30	15	313
	%	34	51	10	5	100

Institutional Responsibility of Respondent		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Presidents	N	10	14	0	1	25
	%	40	56	0	4	
Deans and Directors	N	41	50	9	2	102
	%	40	49	9	2	
Division Chairmen	N	45	64	16	6	131
	%	34	49	12	5	
Faculty and Others	N	11	33	5	3	52
	%	21	63	10	6	
Total	N	107	161	30	12	310
	%	35	52	10	4	100

Number of Occupational Programs		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
0 - 10	N	35	70	9	8	122
	%	29	57	7	7	
11 - 25	N	44	54	12	5	115
	%	38	47	10	4	
26 +	N	26	28	7	1	62
	%	42	45	11	2	
Total	N	105	152	28	14	299
	%	35	51	9	5	100

TABLE 14

Reports of Deviations from Institutional Policy in Student Selection

Institutional Type		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Group I	N	59	54	19	7	139
	%	42	39	14	5	
Group II	N	53	47	17	1	118
	%	45	40	14	1	
Group III	N	12	40	3	1	56
	%	21	71	5	2	
Total	N	124	141	39	9	313
	%	40	45	12	3	100

Institutional Responsibility of Respondent		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Presidents	N	12	12	1	0	25
	%	48	48	4	0	
Deans and Directors	N	41	48	10	3	102
	%	40	47	10	3	
Division Chairmen	N	53	56	20	2	131
	%	40	43	15	2	
Faculty and Others	N	18	25	6	3	52
	%	35	48	12	6	
Total	N	124	141	37	8	310
	%	40	45	12	3	100

Number of Occupational Programs		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
0 - 10	N	39	66	14	3	122
	%	32	54	12	2	
11 - 25	N	53	47	10	5	115
	%	46	41	9	4	
26 +	N	29	20	12	1	62
	%	47	32	19	2	
Total	N	121	133	36	9	299
	%	40	44	12	3	100

TABLE 15

Reports of Deviations from Institutional Policy in Employment of Professional Personnel

Institutional Type		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Group I	N	59	47	24	9	139
	%	43	34	17	6	
Group II	N	59	41	16	2	118
	%	50	35	14	1	
Group III	N	23	28	3	1	55
	%	42	51	5	2	
Total	N	141	116	43	12	312
	%	45	37	14	4	100

Institutional Responsibility of Respondent		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Presidents	N	13	11	1	0	25
	%	52	44	4	0	
Deans and Directors	N	53	36	10	3	102
	%	52	35	10	3	
Division Chairmen	N	60	44	23	4	131
	%	46	34	17	3	
Faculty and Others	N	15	25	8	3	51
	%	29	49	16	6	
Total	N	141	116	42	10	309
	%	46	38	14	3	100

Number of Occupational Programs		Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
0 - 10	N	45	56	15	6	122
	%	37	46	12	5	
11 - 25	N	57	36	17	4	114
	%	50	32	15	4	
26 +	N	36	16	8	2	62
	%	58	26	13	3	
Total	N	138	108	40	12	298
	%	46	36	13	4	100

TABLE 16

Reports of General Education Requirements in Vocational-Technical Programs

Institutional Type		Yes	No	Only Those Leading to a Degree	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Group I	N	107	9	15	3	5	139
	%	77	6	11	2	4	
Group II	N	85	10	20	1	2	118
	%	72	8	17	1	2	
Group III	N	39	5	12	0	0	56
	%	70	9	21	0	0	
Total	N	231	24	47	4	7	313
	%	74	8	15	1	2	100

Institutional Type		Yes	No	Only Those Leading to a Degree	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Presidents	N	17	3	5	0	0	25
	%	68	12	20	0	0	
Deans and Directors	N	79	6	14	1	2	102
	%	77	6	14	1	2	
Division Chairmen	N	96	10	21	3	1	131
	%	73	8	16	2	1	
Faculty and Others	N	37	5	7	0	3	52
	%	71	10	13	0	6	
Total	N	229	24	47	4	6	310
	%	74	8	15	1	2	100

Number of Occupa- Type		Yes	No	Only Those Leading to a Degree	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
0 - 10	N	84	14	21	1	2	122
	%	69	11	17	1	2	
11 - 25	N	85	7	16	2	5	115
	%	73	6	14	2	5	
26 +	N	55	2	4	1	0	62
	%	89	3	6	2	0	
Total	N	224	23	41	4	7	299
	%	75	8	14	1	2	100

TABLE 17

Reports of Amount of General Education Required in Vocational-Technical Programs

Institutional Type		Same as Other Programs	More than Other Programs	Less than Other Programs	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Group I	N	45	3	74	7	10	139
	%	32	2	53	5	7	
Group II	N	41	5	60	4	8	118
	%	35	4	51	3	7	
Group III	N	19	6	21	4	6	56
	%	34	11	37	7	11	
Total	N	105	14	155	15	24	313
	%	34	4	49	5	8	100

Institutional Responsibility of Respondent		Same as Other Programs	More than Other Programs	Less than Other Programs	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Presidents	N	7	0	17	1	0	25
	%	28	0	68	4	0	
Deans and Directors	N	36	2	55	2	7	102
	%	35	2	54	2	7	
Division Chairman	N	42	11	61	8	9	131
	%	32	8	47	6	7	
Faculty & Others	N	19	1	21	4	7	52
	%	37	2	40	8	13	
Total	N	104	14	154	15	23	310
	%	34	5	50	5	7	100

Number of Occupational Programs		Same as Other Programs	More than Other Programs	Less than Other Programs	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
0 - 10	N	47	4	54	7	10	122
	%	39	3	44	6	8	
11 - 25	N	41	4	54	4	12	115
	%	36	3	47	3	10	
26+	N	12	4	41	3	2	62
	%	19	6	66	5	3	
Total		100	12	149	14	24	299
		33	4	50	5	8	100

TABLE 18

Assessments of Effect of Specialized Accreditation on General Education Requirement in Vocational-Technical Programs

Institutional Type		Increases	Decreases	Has No Effect	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Group I	N	12	32	20	68	7	139
	%	9	23	14	49	5	
Group II	N	9	23	28	55	3	118
	%	8	19	24	47	2	
Group III	N	36	1	14	4	1	56
	%	8	19	24	47	2	
Total	N	57	56	62	127	11	313
	%	18	18	20	41	3	100

Institutional Responsibility of Respondent		Increases	Decreases	Has No Effect	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Presidents	N	4	8	6	7	0	25
	%	16	32	24	28	0	
Deans and	N	13	23	22	41	3	102
Directors	%	13	23	21	40	3	
Division	N	34	16	29	49	3	131
Chairmen	%	26	12	22	37	2	
Faculty and	N	6	9	5	28	4	52
Others	%	12	17	10	54	7	
Total	N	57	56	62	125	10	310
	%	18	18	20	40	3	100

Number of Occupational Programs		Increases	Decreases	Has No Effect	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
0 - 10	N	28	18	27	44	5	122
	%	23	15	22	36	4	
11 - 25	N	25	19	24	43	4	115
	%	22	17	21	37	3	
26 +	N	4	18	8	31	1	62
	%	6	29	13	50	2	
Total	N	57	55	59	118	10	299
	%	19	18	20	39	3	100

TABLE 19

Perceptions of Increased Pressure for Specialized Accrediting

Institutional Type		Increased Pressure	No Increased Pressure	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Group I	N	61	45	26	7	139
	%	44	32	19	5	
Group II	N	59	31	28	0	118
	%	50	26	24	0	
Group III	N	44	6	5	1	56
	%	79	11	9	2	
Total	N	164	82	59	8	313
	%	52	26	19	3	100

Institutional Responsibility of Respondent		Increased Pressure	No Increased Pressure	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
Presidents	N	17	7	1	0	25
	%	68	28	4	0	
Deans and	N	53	30	18	1	102
Directors	%	52	29	18	1	
Division	N	64	38	26	3	131
Chairmen	%	49	29	20	2	
Faculty and	N	28	7	14	3	52
Others	%	54	13	27	6	
Total	N	162	82	59	7	310
	%	52	26	19	2	100

Number of Occupational Programs		Increased Pressure	No Increased Pressure	Don't Know	No Answer	Total
0 - 10	N	62	33	23	4	122
	%	51	27	19	3	
11 - 25	N	62	28	22	3	115
	%	54	24	19	3	
26 +	N	30	17	14	1	62
	%	48	27	23	2	
Total	N	154	78	59	8	299
	%	52	26	20	3	100

TABLE 20

Assessments of the Source of Pressure for Specialized Accreditation

Institutional Type		Not Applicable	Within	Outside	Both Areas	No Answer	Total
Group I	N	77	3	41	17	1	139
	%	55	2	30	12	1	
Group II	N	59	1	39	17	2	118
	%	50	1	33	14	2	
Group III	N	12	3	10	31	0	56
	%	21	5	18	55	0	
Total	N	148	7	90	65	3	313
	%	47	2	29	21	1	100

Institutional Responsibility of Respondents		Not applicable	Within	Outside	Both Areas	No Answer	Total
Presidents	N	8	0	15	2	0	25
	%	32	0	60	8	0	
Deans and Directors	N	49	2	26	22	3	102
	%	48	2	25	22	3	
Division Chairmen	N	66	5	32	28	0	131
	%	50	4	24	21	0	
Faculty and Others	N	24	0	15	13	0	52
	%	46	0	29	25	0	
Total	N	147	7	88	65	3	310
	%	47	2	28	21	1	100

Number of Occupational Programs		Not applicable	Within	Outside	Both Areas	No Answer	Total
0 - 10	N	60	4	30	28	0	122
	%	49	3	25	23	0	
11 - 25	N	52	3	29	28	3	115
	%	45	3	25	24	3	
26 +	N	32	0	22	8	0	62
	%	52	0	35	13	0	
Total	N	144	7	81	64	3	299
	%	48	2	27	21	1	100

REFERENCES

Accreditation of junior colleges by specialized or professional agencies. Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Accrediting, January 1962. (Unpublished report)

Blauch, L. E. *Accreditation and higher education*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Health, Education and Welfare, 1959.

Booker, E. E. Survey of general education in technical institutes. *Technical Education News*, 1954, 14 (Special Issue).

Carr-Saunders, A. M. and Wilson, P. A. The emergence of professions. In Nosow and Form (Eds.), *Man, work and society*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1962. Pp. 199-206.

Criteria for membership. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Schools of Music, 1963.

Dickey, F. G. Annual report of the executive director. Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Accrediting, March 1966.

Dickey, F. G. Change, crisis, & challenge. Annual report. Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Accrediting, March 1967.

Fischer, R. C. Accrediting in the context of increasing government support of higher education: A confidential report to the executive committee of the National Commission on Accrediting. Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Accrediting, March 1967. (Unpublished report)

Flexner, A. *Medical education in the United States and Canada*. Boston: D. B. Updyke, Merrymount Press, 1910.

Goode, W. J. Community within a community: The professions. *American Sociological Review*, April 1957, 22.

Greenwood, E. Attributes of a profession. In Nosow and Form (Eds.), *Man, work and society*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1962. Pp. 206-271.

Harris, N. C. *Technical education in the junior college--new programs for new jobs*. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1964.

Harris, N. C. The accreditation of technical schools--an analysis of some major issues. *The North Central Association Quarterly*, Spring 1968, 42(4), 316-321.

Junior college directory. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1966.

McConnell, T. R. *A general pattern for American public higher education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

McConnell, T. R. The university and the state: A comparative study. In W. J. Minter (Ed.), *Campus and capitol*. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966.

Mayor, J. R. *Accreditation of teacher education--its influence on higher education*. Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Accrediting, 1965.

Medsker, L. L. Changes in junior colleges and technical institutes. In L. Wilson (Ed.), *Emerging patterns in American higher education*. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1965. Pp. 79-84.

Medsker, L. L. The community college: Its role and some issues before it. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Urbana, April 1967.

Millett, J. D. *The academic community*: *An essay on organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Minutes: Annual meeting of American Association of Junior Colleges, 1961.

Minutes: Annual meeting of National Commission on Accrediting, 1967.

NCA reports. *Quarterly Bulletin*. Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Accrediting, April 1966.

Nurse Training Act Legislation, Public Law 88-581, September 4, 1964.

The past and the future. Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Accrediting, 1965. (Unpublished report)

Selden, W. K. *Accreditation*: *A struggle over standards in higher education*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Selden, W. K. Current national issues in accreditation. *Junior College Journal*, May 1960, 30.

Wilensky, H. J. The professionalization of everyone? *American Journal of Sociology*, September 1964, 70 (2), 137-158.

END

DEPT. OF HEALTH
EDUCATION AND
WELFARE

U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION
ERIC
DATE FILMED

10-27-69